# **SECRET**

#### 30 October 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: FBIS Historical Officer

SUBJECT

Revised draft of <u>FBIS</u> history titled "The Foreign Documents Division, 1946-1967"



25X1

25X1

1. The DDI Historical Officer has read and approved the revised draft of the FBIS history titled "The Foreign Documents Division, 1946-1967" by has done an excellent job of revising

-

his draft and the paper is now ready for further processing.

2. The reviewer has a single suggestion -- that the present Appendix A "Commentary" be renamed "Conclusion" and made the final chapter of the history. Some minor changes, mostly editorial, have been made directly on the manuscript and are noted for the record in the attachment.

3. The Historical Staff will forward this paper directly to the DDI Historical Board for review prior to final typing of the manuscript in FBIS.

DDI Historical Staff

25X1

Attachment

25X1

SECRET

Declassified in Part -	Sanitized Copy Approve	d for Release 2012/10/16	6: CIA-RDP05-01429R000100060001-5
			ZJ/\ 1

	ì	
IN	TELLIGEN	Call
RA A		7
CENTRAL	*	GENCY
(Gallan		
	STATES OF AM	

٠.٠

THE FOREIGN DOCUMENTS DIVISION 1946 - 1967

Volume I

by	

25X1

# **Secret**

**Secret** 

DDI FBIS 5 April 1974 Copy No. 2 of 2

PERMANENT HISTORICAL DOCUMENT DO NOT DESTROY

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy	Approved for Release 2012/10/16 : CIA-RDP05-01429R000100060001-5
•	
	WARNING
defense of 18, section Its transn	ment contains information affecting the national  f the United States, within the meaning of Title ns 793 and 794, of the US Code, as amended. nission or revelation of its contents to or re- an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.
	25X1
·	WARNING NOTICE SENSITIVE INTELLIGENCE SOURCES AND METHODS INVOLVED
·	

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/10/16: CIA-RDP05-01429R000100060001-5 Access Controlled by CIA History Staff and DDI THE FOREIGN DOCUMENTS DIVISION 1946 - 1967 VOLUME I by25X1 25X1 Approved: Foreign Broadcast Information Service Directorate of Intelligence April 1974 Copies: #1 - CIA-HS#2 - DDI

#### Foreword

The purpose of this history is to record and contemplate the origin, growth, and maturation of foreign-language document exploitation in the US intelligence community. The work was written to provide future intelligence officers assigned responsibility for this function with a record of past accomplishments and failures in document exploitation for comparison and guidance in situations which may then apply.

In commenting on a survey on the usefulness of overt foreign literature performed by the Publications Procurement Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee on Foreign Language Publications, the State Department in 1957 declared that the study had conclusively demonstrated that open published material was "the principal source of information on the U.S.S.R. for many intelligence agencies and a major source of data for most organizations concerned with research on the U.S.S.R." There is ample evidence that this judgment applied equally for open literature from non-Soviet areas.

It was in light of the importance attached to overt documentary materials, as reflected in this statement, that the Foreign Documents Division was established following the end of World War II. The story related in the pages of this history describes the development of foreign-language document exploitation as it unfolded in the course of the next two decades. It sets out to show the many problems, dilemmas, and frustrations encountered, the occasional triumphs and satisfactions achieved, and the lessons learned in the process.

At the outset during and after the war the methodology applied in document collection and exploitation was largely hit or miss, and every "cook" in the community had his fingers in the pot. The history traces the evolution of the activity from this state of the art through the various stages of growth—the consolidation of foreign—language document handling under CIA, the division's quest for official recognition of its common—service mission, the honing and refinement of operations, the expansion of services, and, finally, failure of the attempt to retain independent status.

Of necessity, much of interest in the human sphere has been intentionally, though reluctantly, omitted. FDD's

iii

most important asset was people, talented individuals who contributed immeasurably to whatever success the division enjoyed in performing its mission. Associated with their daily activity was much humor and pathos which in itself would furnish a fascinating account of intelligence production in action, but the limitations of time and space preclude dealing with this aspect in depth in the narrative which follows. The treatment herein has had to be confined to the higher levels of FDD policy and operations.

At this writing the Foreign Documents Division no longer exists. Its function — overt publications exploitation — still continues in a more restricted and somewhat altered form as an adjunct to total overt source monitoring, but the full-blown concept of the operation as the division conceived and nurtured it in the 1950s and early 1960s is now in limbo. Were I to state in brief what FDD's chief accomplishment in the 20 years of its life was, it would be this: it was the major contributor to the orderly and effective development of document exploitation as a primary intelligence function.

And finally, a brief word concerning my qualifications for writing the story of FDD. My academic training, undergraduate and post-graduate, was in the field of history. Following military service during World War II and after, most of it as a signal intelligence officer, I was employed as a civilian by the National Security Agency in 1949. July 1952 I transferred to CIA and have been affiliated with the Agency since then, spending the major part of my CIA career as a member of FDD. In 1967, along with the division's complement and functions, I was absorbed by FBIS and have continued in this status since then. My professional interest and activity in this period were devoted exclusively to overt intelligence collection from open foreign document sources, specifically in the Soviet area -- initially in the economic field, then in political/sociological collection from 1958 to 1966, and finally a return to economic coverage. At the same time I was also an associate of FDD officers working in the various non-Soviet areas of document exploitation and was privileged to observe their dedicated and highly professional conduct of operations.

Langley, Virginia
June 1973

25X1

iv

#### Contents

#### Volume I

			Page
For	ewor	d	iii
ı.		solidation of Document Exploitation in the Postld War II Period	
	A. B. C. D.	Initial Step	4 12
II.		Washington Document Center Joins the Central elligence Group	25
	A. B. C.	Transfer of Document Exploitation to Civilian Control	
III.	New	Approaches to Document Exploitation	53
	A. B.	The Move Toward an Exploitation Function First Try for a Charter	53 70
IV.	The	People and the Organization	80
	A. B. C. D.	Staff Development	
<b>V</b> .	The	Sources	123
	A. B. C. D.	Community Cooperation	134 146

V

			Page
VI.	The	Products	164
	A. B. C.	Phase-Out of Captured Document Processing Transition to Processing of Current Materials. Special Problems	164 177 198
		<ol> <li>Source Curtailment and Security Classification Policy</li></ol>	198 202 208 214
		Volume II	
VII.	The	Consumers	218
	A.	General	218
		<ol> <li>Consumer Attitudes</li></ol>	220 223 231
٠	в.	Intra- and Inter-Organizational Relations	235
		1. The CIA Offices	235 249 258 269 273
VIII.	Trai	nslation Services	278

vi

25X1

			Page
	в.	Translation Coordination: The Central Foreign- Language Document Exploitation File and the	·
		Consolidation Translation Survey	305
		1. Initiation	305 318 321
IX.	A N	ew Charter	333
	A. B. C.	First Steps	333 341
	D.	Coordination	350 355
X.	Gro	wth of Operations	363
	A. B. C. D. E. F.	Reorganization and Reorientation	364 384 390 402 412 423
		1. Ancillary Activities	424 428
	G.	Reorganization of the Reporting Program	436
		Volume III	a a
XI.	Thr	ee FDD Staffs	449
	A. B. C.	Linguistic Support	450 458 <b>471</b>

vii

		<u>Ra</u>	<u>age</u>	٠
XII.	Col	d War Problems	482	
	A.	Emergency War Planning	483	
	•	2. FDD and the Armed Services Document	483 493	
	в.	Vietnam Support	511	
		<ol> <li>Headquarters Translation Service</li> <li>Personnel Support</li> <li>Intelligence Information Reporting</li> </ol>	512 513 516 518	25X1
	c.	The Sputnik Flap: A Dissemination Problem !	526	
XIII.		eansion of Service: The US Joint Publications search Service	548	
	A. B. C.	Its Operations	548 562 584	
XIV.		Versus Machine: FDD and the Automatic  Aguage Processing Experiment	596	
,	A. B. C. D. E.	The Division Turns to Private Industry	601 618 637 641 647	
			647 666	

viii

#### Volume IV

		Page	
XV.	End of	f the Line: Transfer and Merger 676	•
	A. Ti	he OCR Interlude 677	
		. The Transfer and Reasons for It 677 . FDD Under OCR 683	
	B. Me	erger With FBIS 692	
	1. 2. 3.	Group	25 <b>X</b> 1 5 <b>X</b> 1
XVI.		usion	

ix

## Appendixes

	Page	<u>e</u>
À.	Organizational Charts 72	7
	1. 17 December 1946	_
	2. 27 June 1947 729	9
	3. 29 July 1948 73	0
	4. 24 August 1949 73	
	5. 27 June 1951 73	2
	6. 7 May 1953 73	3
	7. 1 October 1953	4
	8. 1 April 1957 73	5
	9. 9 June 1960 73	
	0. 1 April 1965 73	
в.	Foreign Documents Division Statistics, 1947-1967. 73	8
c.	Executive Personnel	9
D.	National Security Council Intelligence Directive	
υ.	No. 16: Foreign Language Publications 74	0
E.	Abbreviations	2
F.	Chronological Table	4
G.	Source References	1

#### VOLUME I

#### CHAPTER ONE

# Consolidation of Document Exploitation in the Post-World War II Period

#### A. Initial Step

The emergence of the Foreign Documents Division of the Central Intelligence Agency was the culmination of a trend toward the organized exploitation of enemy documents which had its inception in the last year or two of World War II and in the immediate postwar period. The use of captured documents as an intelligence source in the conduct of military operations is, of course, as old as war itself; but until the mid-1940s this source of information had been used by the United States only on a narrowly tactical, largely disorganized basis with little or no coordination among the various branches of the armed services. Thus, to the extent that documents were exploited at all, the results were usually incomplete and often duplicative. The exigencies of conducting the war permitted little more than this relatively primitive effort on the lower combat and staff levels.

With the approach of the war's end following the invasion of Europe in the Western theater and the movement of Allied forces against the Japanese home islands in the East, a new factor entered the picture. The rapid progress of the Allied armies, particularly near the end as the German and Japanese home fronts disintegrated, led to the capture of an increasingly large volume of documentary material by the advancing Allied In the absence of an over-all, coordinated plan for handling and disposing of this material, most of it was hurriedly gathered together and temporarily stored in various depots in the respective war zones and here it remained until the end of hostilities. While the war was still in progress, some of the captured material was exploited for tactical purposes by commands which had translation and prisoner interrogation units attached to them for the production of low-level intelligence. Document-processing organizations of this type established in the Pacific theater were the Allied Translator and Interpreter Section, Southwest Pacific Area (ATIS, SWPA), the Southeast Asia Translation and Interrogation Center (SEATIC), the Joint Intelligence Center, Pacific Ocean Area (JICPOA), and the Sino Translation and Interrogation Center, China (SINTIC). Formed primarily to meet the needs of operational intelligence,

these units were equipped to serve only incidentally the long-term strategic needs of the War Department, Army Air and Service Forces, and Navy. Even between the theater commands there was a lack of coordination and adequate liaison; much duplication and overlapping of effort existed. There was no overall plan regarding the types of documents to be exploited or methods of processing them and no effective exchange of techniques or operational results.

Accordingly, in the summer of 1944 the Military Intelligence Service (MIS), G-2, War Department General Staff (WDGS), developed a plan to establish a centralized agency to coordinate the efforts of all theater document sections and to serve the War Department and other authorized Federal and Allied agencies interested in long-range intelligence. As a result of this plan, the Pacific Military Intelligence Research Service (PACMIRS) was activated on 6 September 1944 and based at Camp Ritchie in the Maryland mountains some 75 miles north of Washington. This new agency was at that time the sole organization in the armed forces, and in fact in the government, dedicated, if on a modest scale, primarily to the exploitation of foreign-language documents for strategic intelligence. PACMIRS effectively performed its assigned function down to the end of hostilities

and beyond. Eventually it would serve as one of the building blocks upon which further progress in the development of formalized foreign-language document exploitation was to be based.

#### B. The Washington Document Conferences

Near the close of 1944, with the end of the war increasingly imminent, further thought had to be given to formulating an overall plan for disposition of the captured documents in both war theaters, in regard to both cataloging and permanent storage in the near-term and eventual exploitation of the material on a long-term basis. A step in this direction was taken while the war was still in progress with the convening of a conference in Washington, D.C., to discuss matters related to the disposition of captured Japanese documents. The meeting, held during the period 28 December 1944 - 15 January 1945 under the chairmanship of Col. John R. Lovell, MIS, WDGS, was attended by representatives of the army and navy zone-of-interior and overseas commands, including the various intelligence units.

In the latter contingent were personnel from PACMIRS.

As stated prior to the conference, the problem facing the assembled group was to coordinate the activities of all Allied Japanese-language personnel under an over-all inter-Allied,

inter-service plan aimed at the production of a maximum of intelligence from document sources for each echelon of the Allied air, ground, and naval commands in the Far East and in Washington by utilizing the limited number of such personnel and their product in the most efficient manner.\* 1/ The emphasis on centralization and on coordination of effort in this statement set the tone for future developments in the field of document exploitation, but as events were to prove, particularly during the formative years of the future FDD, the mere definition of the problem was a far cry from easy attainment of the goal stated at the Washington Conference.

To deal with the enormous mass of documents, which were of no tactical value but were considered strategically important, the conference advanced a number of recommendations. It set as the general mission of PACMIRS the establishment of a world-wide organization, with headquarters in or near Washington, for the translation and dissemination of strategic information extracted from captured documents forwarded to it from the various theaters. To facilitate the flow of material to the central headquarters, PACMIRS was to establish advance echelons in each Far East theater to perform the required screening, indexing, and transmitting functions. Precedent for establishment

<sup>\*</sup> For serially numbered source references, see Appendix G.

of such advance echelons was to be found in the system of document exploitation then in force in the Western European theater of operations. PACMIRS was to have no control of theater language units, whose sole function was to deal with exploitation for tactical and local intelligence for theater use.\* 2/

In the course of the next few years the conference's recommendations were acted upon and a gradual beginning was made at bringing order to the chaotic postwar captured document situation. In this connection, a further step was taken in the summer of 1945 when the Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, Maj. Gen. Clayton Bissell, issued a call for a second Washington conference to deal with problems related to handling and exploiting Japanese documents. In his memorandum Bissell placed particular emphasis on securing approval from the military agencies for the establishment of a single Japanese Military Document Section to be located in the Washington area. 3/

<sup>\*</sup> The proscription against interference by the central exploitation facility with local translation units was to carry over in later years during development of FDD-IAC relationships.

The second Washington conference on captured Japanese documents was held as scheduled from 29 to 31 August 1945 and covered much of the same ground as the earlier meeting but with refinements and, on the basis of experience gained in the intervening months, with a closer zeroing in on the target at hand. The conference was organized by a committee consisting of three PACMIRS officers - Maj. William M. Stremlau, Capt. Won Loy Chan, and Col. Sidney P. Marland, newly appointed chief of PACMIRS, who served as committee chairman -- and was attended by representatives of all the services. Its findings and recommendations were far-reaching and in effect established the pattern of document handling and exploitation followed down to and subsequent to the integration of this function by the Central Intelligence Group (CIG) at the end of 1946. agenda presented to the conference and the resultant recommendations covered a broad range and consisted of such varied items as a proposed plan for the physical handling of documents, coordination with existing overseas translation units such as ATIS, a plan for postwar document research, utilization of available personnel, Allied participation in document exploitation, and last, though perhaps most important, a proposal for a single service document center. 4/4

With the end of the war approaching, the conference recognized the receding importance of the great bulk of captured documents for tactical operations. Lower echelons which formerly had handled documents were therefore no longer involved in the document evacuation process beyond locating and safeguarding documentary material and the procurement function would henceforth become the concern of the theater and of interested agencies in the United States, usually, but not always, in cooperation with each other. Moreover, the final and complete exploitation would have to be shifted from the war zones to the Zone of Interior. Accordingly, the conference drew up a detailed plan for the selective collection and transmittal to the United States of captured documents, with special emphasis on coordination of this function with ATIS in Japan and stressing the inter-service aspect of the operation. In this connection, arrangements were also made for the dispatch from the United States to Japan of an advance echelon which was to facilitate the identification of pertinent depositories and collections of captured documents and, following preliminary scrutiny by ATIS for operational purposes, to see to the expeditious forwarding of this material back to Washington for final processing.

Having considered the problem of postwar document handling, the conference also took up the task of planning for a general over-haul and streamlining of existing exploitation facilities in the United States. The war-time operations which had been set up to carry on this function were the product of necessity and, at best, considering the pressures of operating during hostilities, performed their task no worse than circumstances would dictate. Nonetheless, as the conference recognized, the manner of operation was wasteful, duplicative, and incomplete and therefore did not approach the standards envisioned for peace-time document exploitation. 5/ Thus, plans for reorganization were drawn up and subsequently implemented.

At the close of the war three agencies in the Zone of Interior were engaged in the handling of captured enemy documents. These were PACMIRS, already referred to; Op-32F141, established near the end of the war by the Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI) as the naval counterpart of PACMIRS in Washington, D.C.; and the Washington Document Center (WDC), one of the fruits of the first Washington Document Conference, set up in February 1945 as a joint Army-Navy clearing station and evaluation board for captured Japanese documents received from the Far Eastern theaters. As mentioned earlier, the PACMIRS

mission was devoted to the strategic-level exploitation of Japanese material and was aimed mainly toward Army and Air interests. Op-32F141 functions were similar but were conducted primarily with naval requirements in mind. The WDC task, as then constituted, was largely a library function. In its performance WDC forwarded to PACMIRS all documents relating to Army interests, while with respect to Navy documents, only those which WDC considered useful were sent on to Op-32F141, the remainder being destroyed.

In considering this arrangement, three overriding factors were readily evident to representatives at the conference: the wasteful use of highly trained linguistic personnel, soon, with the precipitant postwar demobilization just around the corner, to be in limited supply; the overlapping interest in the documents being processed, not only by the armed services, but also by other government agencies and even non-government organizations as well; and the impracticability of two or three agencies, performing an identical type of operation, being physically so widely separated. Carefully considering these factors the conference recommended incorporation of Army and Navy translating and research facilities into one working unit. Since the Washington Document Center was the focal point for

all captured documents evacuated from the Far East and since Op-32F141 and PACMIRS were intimately associated with WDC, it was considered appropriate that WDC expand to include the functions then performed by these two organizations. The consolidation was to include not only their translation functions but also incorporation of the two document libraries into WDC's holdings. At the same time, expressing doubt that the full advantage of a consolidated document research center could be completely realized unless it were placed in reasonable proximity to the using agencies, the conference recommended abandonment of Camp Ritchie as the PACMIRS site and the transfer of PACMIRS personnel to Washington. 6/ In the matter of personnel, the conference representatives expressed concern that the imminent release from military service of the bulk of the armed forces would cause unrest among the key specialist personnel of WDC who had to be retained indefinitely in service. This factor, coupled with the need for reducing Army strength in the Military District of Washington, indicated to the conference the advisability of providing Civil Service positions for certain qualified translator and non-translator personnel. 7/

With its work completed, the conference prepared a final report and submitted it to higher headquarters. In retrospect

the recommendations and decisions adopted by the conference must reflect to the credit of its participants, in particular of its steering committee. The groundwork laid here did much to ease the transition to strategic-level peace-time document exploitation and the pattern of action adopted proved to be most effective in its subsequent development.

#### C. The Washington Document Center (Advanced)

With the end of hostilities in September 1945 and as a first step in implementing the recommendations adopted at the second Washington Document Conference, measures were taken to activate and dispatch to Tokyo the WDC forward echelon, which was designated the Washington Document Center (Advanced). Scheduled to leave for Japan early in October, delays for various reasons prevented the unit from departing before the last week in November. A complement of 29 officers and 31 enlisted men reached Tokyo on 24 November and upon arrival joined a Navy group already on the scene and working. In all, 91 Army and Navy personnel were involved in the project at its inception, of which 39 were officers and 52 enlisted men. Approximately half of the group were linguists. 8/ According to the recommendations of the second Washington Document Conference, WDC (Adv) was scheduled to remain in Japan only

three to four months, but this estimate proved optimistic and the unit required about half a year to complete its work.

At the second Washington Document Conference a preliminary definition of the WDC (Adv) mission in the Far East had been drawn up. By the end of October these functions, basically unchanged, had been more closely defined through liaison between the officers concerned at both ends of the pipe-line, that is, in Washington and Tokyo. Approval had also been secured from Gen. MacArthur's SCAP Headquarters, specifically through the SCAP G-2, Gen. Willoughby. As set up, the plan called for close coordination between the Washington group and ATIS, the Tokyo-based document center, and in fact this meant, indirectly at least, that WDC (Adv) was to be placed in support of ATIS, since ATIS would be relieved of the burden of serving the Washington agencies and would thus be able to concentrate on meeting theater requirements. In this connection it was anticipated that in addition to Army-Navy requirements, WDC (Adv) would also look after the interests of authorized civilian government departments in its search for and handling of documents. 9/ It was felt that this arrangement would go far toward preventing a confused document situation like that which had arisen in Europe as a result of the independent action of many agencies after the conclusion of hostilities there. 10/

As finally agreed, the functions of WDC (Adv) in the Far East entailed essentially the establishment of a central document clearing point in the Nippon Yusen Kabushiki Kaisha (NYK) Building in Tokyo, which was to receive all documents selected in the field, keep all collection agencies in Japan informed of available materials, and see to shipment of the screened documents to WDC in Washington. To avoid duplication and assure expeditious evacuation of high-priority documents, technical specialists on its staff were to maintain liaison with War Department technical teams in Japan. The actual screening for documents was to be accomplished by WDC (Adv) teams which were to coordinate their activities with ATIS screening operations in the field. This collection coordination was to extend to Korea as well as Japan. As documents were seized, ATIS was to extract from them all information pertaining to matters of interest to the Supreme Allied Commander and then continue the flow of documents to WDC (Adv) for shipment to Washington. Finally, WDC (Adv) was to maintain a document information center to serve all intelligence teams active in Japan. Its function was to advise collecting agencies of the volume and quality of material on hand or evacuated relating to subjects of interest to the collecting agency. 11/

Despite the usual initial confusion in setting up the operation, WDC (Adv) became a functioning organization by early December, largely through the efforts of the Executive Officer, Capt. Wesley Meginn. It was composed of six parts: the Headquarters Staff with an Army officer as chief and a Naval officer as his deputy, the Production and Information Section, the Special Acquisitions Section, the Liaison Section, the Documents Section, and the Teams Section. The latter was composed of 16 field teams, each consisting of a language officer, a language enlisted man, and a basic enlisted man. 12/

Thus established, the personnel of WDC (Adv) went to work. Immediate postwar conditions in Japan, and also in Korea, were chaotic, particularly, from the WDC (Adv) standpoint, in connection with enemy official documents and records. Because of the deteriorating home front near the end of the war, most of the collections, where they had survived destruction, had been neglected and left in great disarray and therefore required intensive screening. A screening team sent to Korea early in January 1946 found the situation tense and fluid. The hardening in Korean and American Military Government attitudes was such that a second screening team sent from Tokyo the following month was actually unsuccessful in evacuating material of any

real value. The January survey revealed that considerable valuable material was available. At the turn of the year and only four months after liberation the Koreans were still so anti-Japanese that they were willing to throw out anything Japanese, but a month later, and possibly as a result of the January survey, the value of Japanese records and official documents was beginning to be recognized by the Koreans and they therefore became much more difficult to obtain. 13/ This instance was quite typical of the problems facing the WDC (Adv) screening teams in the Far East. However, despite the numerous problems encountered, the unit was eminently successful in fulfilling the task it had been sent to do, and in the six months that it spent in Japan it succeeded in collecting, selecting, and evacuating to Washington 650,000 items, some

## D. Consolidation of Exploitation Activities

Meanwhile, as the overseas work of WDC (Adv) continued, progress was being made in Washington on the important move toward consolidation of the various document exploitation facilities in the Capital area. This was, however, not accomplished without delays and initial set-backs in the move. On 3 January 1946 an inter-service meeting, termed the Washington

Document Center Conference, was convened to discuss the general subject of postwar document exploitation. A number of recommendations were put forth which threatened to sabotage the earlier-expressed concept of centralizing document exploitation in PACMIRS and, subsequently, in its successor organization, the expanded Washington Document Center. This trend was protested by Sidney Marland's successor as chief of PACMIRS, Col. Gaspardi F. Blunda. In a memorandum to the Director of Intelligence Research, MIS, Blunda opposed the apparent purpose of the meeting's participants, who, in contravention to the August 1945 Washington Document Conference, seemed intent on decentralizing PACMIRS so that each government agency could start to exploit documents solely to satisfy its own requirements. Based on the Washington Conference deliberations and recommendations, Blunda vigorously emphasized the need to centralize linguistic effort in PACMIRS/OP-32F141 (the future WDC) since documentary research by the operational agencies could only lead to wasteful competition for and employment of the few available linguists and to inadequate dissemination of the information. With the increased load which would be put on the new WDC shortly it was essential that piecemeal and competitive attempts to obtain documentary

information should not be indulged in. The alternative, Blunda concluded, was that decentralization would result in PACMIRS being merely a clearing house, which was the present function of the old WDC and would obviate the need for an organization such as the Washington Document Conference had recommended. 15/

This impassioned plea did not allay the problem and pressures for decentralization were to recur frequently in the next few years. This was, however, a period of trial and error, and decisions and recommendations valid one day were often subject to change the next. The situation was one of flux. It was with problems such as this that the augmented Washington Document Center came into existence.

During the fall of 1945 and spring of 1946, while WDC (Adv)
was actively screening and collecting captured enemy documents
in the Far East, the entire Japanese document exploitation
venture in the Washington area was being merged into a joint
Army-Navy operation. On 17 April 1946, PACMIRS, Op-32F141, and
the old WDC were combined as a single operation in one location,
assuming the existing name of "Washington Document Center" (WDC)
for the new composite grouping. In this form it operated as
Section F-5 of the Office of Naval Operations until 1 December 1946
when it was transferred to the newly formed Central Intelligence
Group as part of that agency's Office of Reports and Estimates (ORE).

This consolidation of document exploitation marked the actual inception of what was to become the Foreign Documents Division.

The new organization was first headquartered in the Steuart Building at Fifth and K Streets, N.W., in Washington and remained at this location for the next seven and a half months until its integration into CIG. The first head of the consolidated WDC was Ranson Fullinwider, a Navy captain. His tour in this assignment was relatively short, some three months, and he was succeeded in July by Cmdr. Mark T. Little, who remained in charge of the operation for the duration of its existence as a service-controlled organization.

The job of these two men and their subordinates consisted primarily of overseeing the transition of the enlarged document exploitation effort from a war-time to a peace-time basis. What this amounted to was the liquidation of document work based on war-related requirements, the preparation for and adjustment to an expanded document-exploitation program necessitated by the large influx of enemy documents sent to Washington by WDC (Adv), and, finally, readjustments required in connection with personnel shifts, a problem created not only by the new amalgamation but even more by the end of the war. It was doubtless the last of these aspects which caused the greatest difficulty. Still a service organization at this time, WDC was a hybrid of the most

varied kind. It consisted of officers, enlisted men, and enlisted women, of linguists and non-linguists, of personnel from all components of the United States armed forces, from the British Army, Navy and Air Force, and from the Canadian Army. At the time of the amalgamation it even included some civilians. The major problem the unit had to face was the one of flux and impermanence. With the war just over and rapid demobilization the vogue, the chances of losing valuable experience and talent were, of course, infinitely greater than under war-time conditions or in a stable peace-time civilian economy. When the three units combined into one, the total complement amounted to 278 individuals. 16/ This figure varied from week to week but remained fairly stable until August 1946. Indeed, as reported in the weekly progress report of 24 July 1946, it once increased to a total of 309 personnel. From mid-August on, however, personnel totals gradually decreased until at the end of November — on the eve of the integration into CIG — the figure had declined to 161 individuals.

While the scope of operations of the new WDC was considerably enlarged by the April amalgamation, the functions of the three combined units changed little if at all. A gradual interchange of expertise and personnel occurred but actual

change in the organization at first was more the result of the external influences already cited than of deliberate internal innovation. The task of coping with administrative shifts left little time for other matters, so that, qualitatively if not in quantity of workload, the organization marked time for its first seven months.

Organizationally, the Washington Document Center, as of 1 August 1946, included the administrative staff headed by Ordr. Little as chief of the Center and three operational sections -- Library, Research, and Publications -- which were headed, respectively, by Lt. Joseph Becker, Lt. Cmdr. John Bagnall, and Capt. Wesley Meginn, the latter only recently returned from his assignment with WDC (Adv) in the Far East. The Research Section included seven sub-sections: Screening, Editorial, and the so-called Projects A, B, C, D, and E (code designations for the following research areas: Soviet Russia, Manchuria-Mongolia, China, Japan, and Scientific and Technical). 17/ It is of interest to note that the respective chiefs of the Publications Section (Meginn), the Soviet Russia Project (Talbot Bielefeldt), and the Scientific and Technical Project (Lawrence Bucans) continued as chiefs of these subject areas for the remainder of their professional careers. By the time these men retired, the importance and size of these components had grown considerably.

The mission of the new WDC was threefold: the rapid exploitation of the documents coming in from the Far East for actual or potential strategic intelligence based on requirements from the War and Navy Departments and other authorized agencies; establishment of a central comprehensive library embracing all Far Eastern documents received; and the disposal of those documents deemed of no value to the War and Navy Departments and their consignment to the Library of Congress.

In connection with its library function and to facilitate research by its consumers, the first efforts of WDC were directed toward completion of document cataloging and indexing according to the MORI-KTYOSHI (Japanese dual-decimal system) and the BID system (Basic Intelligence Directive). The potential gains from this operation were considerable since the collection forwarded to Washington by WDC (Adv) was at that time the world's most complete source of information on the Far East.

As regards its exploitation function, WDC's major effort was devoted to the processing of documents pertaining to the USSR, Far East, and the Eastern European countries. Only a small portion of linguist and non-linguist strength was spent on the processing of material on other world areas on a long-range basis. To facilitate the operation, close liaison was maintained

with the intelligence agencies of the War and Navy Departments in order to obtain guidance in the exploitation effort. It was anticipated that by 1 October 1946 all documents pertaining to the USSR, Far East, and Eastern Europe would be scanned, and after that date, consistent with the personnel at hand, the Center's effort would be placed on the continuing exploitation, that is, translation and abstracting, of the highest-priority documents dealing with these areas as such material was received. At the same time WDC would continue to catalogue and index documents then in process. 18/ During this period, with a requirements regime based on the needs of potential users of the material still in a formative stage, the Center's work was largely of a contingency nature designed to bring order to a large mass of material.

By 1 August 1946 approximately half of the 500 tons of documents seized by WDC (Adv) and sent to Washington had been processed. This left the remainder to be catalogued, indexed, and exploited in the two months remaining if the 1 October deadline was to be met. 19/ This promised to be a formidable task in view of the deteriorating personnel situation. The loss of all civilian employees in WDC was anticipated by October and the continuing reduction in linguist officer and

enlisted personnel strength through attrition would further handicap the successful completion of the mission. US Navy participation would be materially decreased as of 1 December 1946. That of the British Navy had ended on 15 August and the participation of the British Army would cease as of 1 January 1947. Moreover, Canadian Army and RAF operations after 1 January were still in question. The problem facing WDC was clearly evident and an appeal was made to augment the WDC personnel in the near future. 20/

Fortunately for the future of postwar document exploitation, planning was already under way to alleviate the crisis. Recognizing the increasingly precarious position of the Army and Navy as sponsors because of postwar budget cuts and aware of service plans for the abandonment, or at best the drastic de-emphasizing, of the operation, the recently established Central Intelligence Group initiated negotiations involving the Army, Navy, and CIG during the late summer of 1946 relative to centralizing the document exploitation effort under CIG control. 21/ This development and the adjustments attendant to it were now to occupy the Washington Document Center for the next six to twelve months; by that time the pattern upon which the evolvement of the organization was to be based had been fairly well established.

#### CHAPTER TWO

# The Washington Document Center Joins the Central Intelligence Group

### A. Transfer of Document Exploitation to Civilian Control

In line with the general reorganization of the Central. Intelligence Group effected by Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg following his appointment as Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) in June 1946 and pursuant to the policy of replacing committee procedure by direct executive action, the Interdepartmental Coordinating and Planning Staff (ICAPS) was created on 20 July with Donald D. Edgar as its head. During the next six months this group initiated, planned, and completed a number of important projects, one of which was the incorporation of the Washington Document Center into CIG operations. As stated earlier, this move was necessitated by the inability of the armed services, because of budget and personnel cuts following the end of the war, to continue the operation. From a financial standpoint, the move of WDC to CIG proved successful and resulted in a budgetary saving not only to each department involved but to the government as a whole. However, as early as

the initial stages of negotiations which led up to the transfer, it was foreseen that the benefits would be not only financial but in the long run would also include greater effectiveness in this type of operation. This was true because from the outset it was anticipated that the new organization, once separated from military control, could be used to form a nucleus for the further centralization of foreign document exploitation. The activity was at that time widely scattered, particularly among non-military organizations within the government; none of these could perform the operation as efficiently as a centralized unit. 22/

The groundwork for incorporation of the document exploitation operation under the CIG aegis was laid with considerable care. The task of investigating its feasibility and impact was assigned to Col. Sheffield Edwards, Assistant Executive Director, CIG. During a period of several months beginning in September 1946, he conducted a series of conferences and visitations which resulted in a variety of recommendations pertaining to the subject. As a first step, he visited the War Department's Washington Document Center to study its operations, functions, and value. As a result of his findings he recommended that CIG take over the 55 War Department civilian personnel of WDC without delay and before 9 October,

their projected date of discharge, and, further, that plans be made to take over the entire Document Center in its existing location in the Steuart Building on or about 1 December. It was also as a result of one of Edwards' directives that the initial subordination of WDC within CIG was established. In September the Office of Research and Evaluation\* was directed to make definite plans to take control of WDC by 1 December. 23/ WDC's assignment to ORE at this time appears, in retrospect, to have been a move of convenience, although there were those in ORE who felt then, as later, that the arrangement was proper because the true role of WDC/FDD personnel should be to serve ORE research efforts rather than to provide a common service for all government intelligence organizations. The Office of Operations (00), to which WDC was subsequently shifted, was then not yet in existence, though it was established a month after WDC was assigned to ORE.

It is of interest at this stage to note that the problem of WDC/FDD subordination has been a recurrent one. At intervals throughout its life-time the question of the proper place of FDD in the general CIA scheme-of-things has evoked indecision.

<sup>\*</sup> This component was redesignated the Office of Reports and Estimates on 27 October 1946.

At least in part this was due to the "neither-fish-nor-fowl" nature of the exploitation operation — indecision as to whether it was research, pure collection, a linguistic function, or a library operation. It was in fact all of these and this made its placement difficult. Its assignment to OO, when that Office was established on 17 October 1946, was more or less by way of compromise.

In view of the impending budgetary and personnel reductions, the Army and the Navy, even at the intelligence staff level, were not opposed to the loss of the document exploitation operation to the new civilian organization and in fact they actively sought the transfer. This attitude was confirmed in separate memoranda by Col. Ennis, Chief of the Intelligence Group, WDGS, 24/ and by Gen. Chamberlin, Director of Intelligence, WDGS, the latter speaking for ONI as well as ID. 25/

A meeting between Ennis and Col. Edwards of CIG to discuss arrangements concerning service personnel assignments in the proposed transfer of the document exploitation function to CIG was held on 8 October. At this conference 12 officers and 20 enlisted men, representing key personnel then on duty with WDC, were authorized for WDC assignment for the period 1 December 1946 - 1 July 1947. 26/

As a follow-up to the Ennis-Edwards conference, two ORE representatives, Col. Perry and met on 10 October with Cmdr. Little, the WDC chief, and Maj. William B. Pohlman, his deputy, to discuss details of the impending transfer. The outcome of the meeting was Perry's recommendation, subsequently adopted, that provision be made by CIG for the WDC Table of Organization (T/O), totaling 151, for the period 1 December 1946 - 1 July 1947. This T/O was to comprise 98 Army and 53 Navy people, including, respectively, 28 and 36 civilians. The latter figure included some 28 of the Naval officers who would be converting to civilian status. 27/ At the same time Little drew up a tentative T/O for continuance of the operation under CIG after 1 December. This organizational plan provided for a total of 156 employees and placed strong emphasis on retaining military officers in key positions. 28/

25X1

The preliminaries completed, the formal transfer of WDC to the Central Intelligence Group occurred in December 1946. On 27 November Col. Edwin K. Wright, Executive to the DCI, in replying to a memorandum from the Secretary of the Navy, stated that in pursuance of the request received from Gen. Chamberlin, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, and Adm. Inglis, Director of Naval Intelligence (DNI), the Central Intelligence Group would take over operation of the Washington Document Center on 1 December 1946. 29/

For the first month WDC carried on its functions under its usual designation and as part of ORE; then, on 31 December, a memorandum was issued revoking the ORE subordination and making the organization, retroactive to 1 December, part of the Office of Operations (OO), a relationship which was to last for the next 17 years. At the same time, the name "Washington Document Center" passed into history and the unit was redesignated the "Documents Branch" of OO. 30/ On 2 January 1947 Documents Branch (DB) personnel were formally welcomed into CIG by the DCI 31/ and the transition from military to civilian control was completed.

#### B. Problems of Administrative Integration

The move to CIG marked the beginning of a period — lasting well into 1947 — of assimilation into the new parent organization and adjustment to new situations. The work of DB continued for the moment basically as before, with major emphasis on captured document exploitation. However, this was already beginning to change to a new concept of document work resulting from the fact that the intelligence to be derived from captured materials was running dry and was rapidly being replaced by a demand for information extracted from current sources.

It may be well at this point, for the record, to note briefly what the functions of DB were on the eve of its transfer

to CIG, since all subsequent changes in the unit's operations were based upon this statement of mission. At the time of the transfer WDC was operating, according to the Acting Chief John Bagnall, as "a basically factual research organization on the Far East, to provide CIG with current and background intelligence data on the Far East as found available in oriental language publications." 32/ With the change-over, the wording was revised and the new Documents Branch was designated as "an organization for the exploitation of foreign documents" tasked "to provide the CIG with current intelligence information on foreign countries as found available in foreign language publications." 33/ A memorandum issued by the CIG Executive for Personnel and Administration several days later spelled out in detail the functions of DB as follows:

- (1) To receive foreign documents for cataloguing, summarizing, and translation, the determination of documents to be received to be made in coordination between the Assistant Director for Operations (AD/O) and the Assistant Director for Collection and Dissemination (AD/CD).
- (2) To prepare subject lists of accessions for distribution as determined by the Office of Collection and Dissemination (OCD).
- (3) To prepare extracts and summaries from documents in its possession to meet requirements received from OCD.
- (4) To prepare literal translations of documents in its possession to meet requirements received from OCD.

- (5) To provide such technical liaison with similar activities as might be authorized by the AD/O.
- (6) To establish exploitation projects on a continuing basis as required.
- (7) To dispose of documents not needed in accordance with policies set by the AD/O and Assistant Director for Reports and Estimates (AD/RE). 34/

As is evident, these functions were designed primarily for the processing of captured documents with which the organization was wholly concerned in the immediate postwar period. However, as stated above, a change to current material was in the offing and when this occurred, later in 1947, the functions listed above, with minor revision, remained applicable.

Operational adjustments were, however, not the only ones demanding attention. Of more immediate concern were administrative problems. Thus while operations initially continued nearly unchanged under rather disruptive circumstances, great emphasis in the beginning was placed upon solving organizational problems.

As a first step, the transf	er of WDC to CIG was marked by		•
a physical relocation from the St	euart Building to		25X1
	This was to be the first of	•	25 <b>X</b> 1

- 32 -

<sup>\*</sup> A proposal to move DB to the Navy Yards and Docks Building near Arlington Cemetery had been rejected when it was found that that structure was not strong enough to support the weight of the many documents in DB's possession.

four moves made by the unit. Consideration was then and in the future sporadically given to placing it in close proximity to its major consumers in CIG, and later in CIA, particularly so when the new Headquarters Building was under construction during 1959-1961, but a complete fusion never came about, and throughout its life FDD conducted its functions physically separated from its consumer offices. At best this arrangement constituted an inconvenience, at worst, it was inefficient.

The move to was completed on the night of 30 November 1946 in coordination with 25X1 Strict security measures accompanied the move of the

25X1

25X1

25X1

organizational equipment and documents, with commissioned Army and Navy personnel acting as guards.

The major concern of DB and its new parent organization during the transition period was, and was to remain for some time to come, the problem of personnel. There appeared to be no diminution of work during the postwar period and indeed, with the consolidation of intelligence operations under the DCI in 1946/1947 and the gradual intensification of the Cold War in the period following, the workload increased considerably. The problem, therefore, became one of finding, developing, and maintaining a staff commensurate in size with the work that had to be done. This proved to be a difficult undertaking.

Reference has already been made to the 650,000 captured documents received by WDC. At the beginning of 1947 about 120,000 of these documents had not been completely processed and it was estimated that of this number about 50,000 possessed intelligence value and deserved further exploitation. In addition, there was a backlog of 350 accession lists covering 70,000 documents. Accession lists were being published at the rate of ten per week but the backlog remained constant due to the fact that this output of accession lists only equalled the intake of documents. The receipt of material in early 1947 averaged about 10,000 items per month, composed of about equal parts of captured documents and current periodicals. 35/ At the same time, roughly ten requests per day were received from the 41 consumers with whom DB maintained liaison and by January 1947 there existed a current backlog of approximately 2,000 requirements which had accumulated since the creation of the amalgamated WDC in April 1946. 36/ Despite periodic efforts to weed out outdated requirements which were no longer valid, the heavy personnel loss due to demobilization and the disruptive effects of the transfer to CIG made the effort to keep

up with the remaining requests a losing one. It is easy to see that if the trend toward personnel departures then underway had not been offset by an effective recruitment program, the situation in document exploitation would soon have reached crisis proportions. Even with the efforts undertaken then and continued later on, the problem of securing and holding qualified personnel sufficient to cope with DB's needs was never completely solved. It came closest to solution after establishment of the Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) some ten years later but even this was only a partial answer.

When WDC transferred to CIG on 1 December 1946, only 87 (28 Army, 14 Navy, and 45 civilians) of the 250 persons then assigned to the organization actually made the change. 37/ According to the DB report issued at the end of the first quarter of 1947, this total had increased slightly, to 92, by 1 January 1947, 38/ but the overall decline continued and on 11 February Donald Edgar, head of ICAPS, reported to the Director that, due to losses in the military personnel assigned to the Document Branch, its roster had been reduced to 69 persons and it was faced with a further reduction of about 20. From a numerical standpoint, this marked the nadir of the DB personnel problem. Edgar recommended an augmentation

#### SECRET

of DB personnel in order to permit the unit effectively to fulfill the requirements of Intelligence Advisory Board (IAB) agencies. 39/

The loss of military personnel in DB referred to by Edgar resulted in part from a CIG memorandum of 9 January 1947, which, in view of the current over-strength status of CIG, required its components to take immediate steps to release excess officers either to civilian life or back to the military services, depending upon the category of the individual. 40/ This created a particular hardship for DB, almost half composed of military personnel at the time of its creation a month earlier. The organization, however, took steps to comply with the order and officers and men were gradually released, either by absorption as civilians into DB, by discharge to civilian life outside the unit, or by reassignment to the Army or Navy. Among those in the first category were most of the top echelon of DB, including Lt. Cmdr. John Bagnall, at this time Acting Chief of the organization, and also many in lower ranks of DB who in time to come were to form the nucleus upon which the expanded FDD would be built. The phase-out process was a gradual one and took approximately nine months to complete. The last contingent, six enlisted men, was scheduled for release on 30 September. 41/

Thus the personnel estimate submitted by Cmdr. Little
early in October 1946 at CIG's request, amounting to 151, far
exceeded the actual number on duty. Prospects of meeting this
figure appeared bleak and the attitude of the top CIG administrators, faced as they were by their own diverse problems of
change, gave no promise of a rapid improvement. When

Advisor for Management, forwarded the memorandum

25X1

recommending the 151 T/O to the AD/O for his suggestions for
action,

noted that "since it [WDC] is a going concern

25X1

it cannot be given first priority in the development of its
final organizational structure and personnel requirements." 42/

Although the personnel situation in DB in the formative stages of the organization was discouraging and many of the problems remained endemic, circumstances gradually improved and with better organized recruitment, the branch, under a T/O of 344 attained at the end of 1952, eventually reached a complement of more than 300 employees. From 1953 on, it remained on a plateau which seldom varied from a personnel figure of 290-300.

The end of the war and the subsequent transfer of document exploitation activities from military to civilian control created a problem for DB in another sphere, namely, an aspect of security. To a limited extent at least, this also contributed to the personnel shortage in the unit. The problem

pertained to the situation created by the attachment during the war of Allied personnel, British and Canadians, to the document exploitation units set up at that time. For example, linguists from the Canadian Army Language School at Vancouver, British Columbia, reinforced the language efforts of the Americans at PACMIRS. Later on, in February 1945, as a result of the first Washington Document Conference two months earlier, where one of the recommendations pertained to consolidation of inter-Allied language specialists, ten British linguist officers were assigned to PACMIRS. One of these, Lt. Col. P. Pender-Cudlip, who had served as British War Office representative at the conference, was even designated chief of the Translation Group at Camp Ritchie. Other British and Canadian officers were appointed section heads. With the incorporation of PACMIRS into WDC the British and Canadian contingents were transferred along with their American counterparts. Now, with the move to CIG, a civilian organization with higher security standards, circumstances changed. Consequently, on 16 December 1946

25X1

25X1

to the AD/O a memorandum involving a policy change relative to Allied personnel. It directed that henceforth no Allied personnel would be assigned to WDC; all prior commitments relating to Allied force personnel at WDC were considered

the Assistant Executive Director, submitted

## SECRET

abrogated as of 1 December 1946, the date of transfer of WDC to CIG; and the senior officers of the British and Canadian groups would henceforth serve, with a reasonable number of assistants, as liaison officers to WDC for their respective The extent of their liaison functions was to be set at the discretion of the Chief, WDC and the AD/O. 43/ A subsequent memorandum from the Executive Director spelled out the future DB relationship with the British in additional detail and stated in effect that requests for dissemination of materials to the British had to come through channels, via the Foreign Liaison Office of ID or the Director, ONI, whichever had primary cognizance of the subject matter. In recognition of the fact that this arrangement was somewhat cumbersome, DB was authorized, with minor exceptions, to maintain its earlier relationship with the British. This was to be accomplished through routine day-to-day contacts by DB personnel with a British liaison unit, an organization eventually replaced by a single British liaison officer. was authorized to continue furnishing the British with classified accession lists and with translations of a non-sensitive nature. 44/ However, the use as heretofore of British personnel in the regular operations of the component was discontinued.

In the long term the effect of the change in DB operations was minor, but its immediate consequence was to deprive the organization of badly needed, well-trained linguistic personnel.

#### C. Consolidation Completed

In the course of its 20-year existence there were numerous changes and adjustments in DB's structure and operational methods, but on the whole these were related to changing problems and requirements within the Agency and were relatively minor in the overall picture. The early period, on the other hand, was one of volatile transition, and changes came rapidly as all the loose ends of document exploitation were assembled under one authority. This assimilative process lasted until mid-1947 when the German Military Documents Section (GMDS) and the Special Documents Section (SDS), the last two document units still operating under military control, were gathered into the CIG fold. From then on, the structure of CIG's document exploitation facility was essentially established and changes were for the most part dedicated to refining the operation for maximum efficiency.

Unlike the earlier components incorporated into DB, all three of which were concerned with processing Japanese materials, GMDS and SDS operations were oriented to the European theater and therefore to German documents. GMDS, which during the war had

operated under the War Department at Fort Hunt, south of Alexandria, Virginia, performed primarily a library/depository function. This required a relatively modest complement, which in the fall of 1946 was authorized at 5 officers and 15 enlisted men, 45/ but at the end of January 1947 was actually 8 officers and 14 enlisted men. 46/ On the other hand, SDS, also part of the War Department, had been set up after the war, in late May 1946, at Holabird Signal Depot, near Baltimore, to exploit captured German documents dealing with the Soviet economy and to a lesser extent Russian documents on the same subject captured by the Germans. A series of research projects had been established at SDS in response to intelligence requirements issued by the War Department Intelligence Division and the Air Intelligence Division. The main SDS effort was reserved for its Industrial Card File (ICF), an important collection of Soviet industrial plant information, which was highly regarded in the US intelligence community. It was expected that reconstruction of the most recent German intelligence picture of the USSR economy would be completed by the end of May 1947. 47/ The personnel strength of SDS in October 1946 was 6 officers, 5 enlisted personnel, and 44 civilians. 48/ By reason of their respective functions, GMDS, then in the Pentagon, and SDS personnel worked in close conjunction with

each other.

In October 1946, with the project for consolidation of the Japanese documents organizations well advanced and in line with the earlier policy decision to divest the military of the document exploitation function, Gen. Chamberlin of the War Department Intelligence Division suggested that GMDS and SDS also be included in the documents exploitation facility of CIG and proposed that this transfer be effected by 1 April 1947. 49/ The logic of incorporating German documents with Japanese documents exploitation seemed self-evident and a study was instituted under ICAPS auspices to investigate the advisability of this move. 50/ Despite the apparent soundness of incorporation there seems to have been some hesitation in carrying it out. Even as late as February 1947 no final decision had yet been reached, although it was expected that at least one of the units, presumably SDS, would be accepted. 51/ Finally, CIG expressed its willingness to take over the document exploitation responsibilities of SDS as of 1 June 1947 and to accept the transfer of the 44 civilians then employed by the organization. CIG also agreed to take over the document screening and intelligence operations performed by GMDS but it refused to accept the library functions of the section. In the matter of document custody CIG expressed its agreement with the tentative plan of ID to turn over to the Adjutant General

documents in GMDS's possession as well as documents received from the European theater after the GMDS transfer to CIG on 1 June 1947. This was to be contingent, however, upon provision of ready access to these documents for CIG and other members of the intelligence community. 52/ To facilitate the document handling involved, DB provided a CIG detachment to operate in the Pentagon in direct conjunction with the Adjutant General. This group took over the title "German Military Documents Section" and all the non-intelligence functions performed earlier by the original GMDS. These included receiving, library cataloguing, shelving, storing, loaning to other agencies, recording, and otherwise handling and disposing of documents. 53/

In connection with the transfer of SDS duties to CIG some concern was expressed about the fate of the ICF. The War Department Intelligence Division felt strongly about the need for uninterrupted continuation of this project and had so stipulated in a memorandum directed to the DCI. 54/ With a subsequent memorandum in April CIG allayed ID's concern by agreeing to assume full responsibility for continuance of the Industrial Card File project of SDS. 55/ This did not fully resolve the question of the project, however, at least so far as CIG was concerned. Gen. Sibert, the AD/O, made the

point that maintenance of the ICF was outside the scope of a document branch since the operation involved the preparation of cards from non-document sources. He suggested instead ORE acceptance of responsibility for the activity when the transfer was made on 1 June but he agreed to let DB handle it temporarily in view of the difficulty involved in separating ICF functions from document exploitation so soon after transfer. A division of labor could be more easily arranged later on after approval and implementation within ORE of the pending Foreign Industrial Establishments Project. 56/ It was subsequently agreed that ORE would take over ICF operations on or about 1 October 1947. 57/ Finally, dictated by changes within CIG which separated library reference functions from ORE, a memorandum was issued in late October which provided for the transfer of the ICF Project from DB (now renamed the Foreign Documents Branch) to the Reference Center, Administration and Management (A&M), by 1 December 1947 and its incorporation into the Foreign Industrial Register as a central service. 58/ From then on FDB's only association with ICF was its continuing contribution of data from foreign document sources.

The official transfer of SDS and GMDS from the Intelligence Division to DB was scheduled to take place on 1 June 1947 and was so authorized. At that time the units and their facilities and personnel were to be moved to the DB premises

SDS from Baltimore and GMDS from the

25X1

Pentagon. The move was to include all civilians and such military as could be persuaded to take civilian employment. It was suggested in the authorization that no grades higher than P-6 should be offered and that these should be limited to three or four in that grade for civilianizing officers. Civilians then on duty were to be assured of permanency of employment provided they could pass the Civil Service Board and the necessary background investigations. 59/ Though not then foreseen, the latter provision was to create considerable difficulties in consummating the transfer. Early in May, because of doubt that security clearances on the civilians to be transferred could be completed before the deadline and also to permit the completion of certain short-range projects and special translations still in process, the date of transfer was delayed a month and set at 30 June. 60/

On 10 June, in preparation for the anticipated amalgamation of SDS and GMDS with DB, a tentative new T/O was approved for the augmented Documents Branch. It increased the T/O strength of the organization to 250 and raised the personnel ceiling to 190. 61/Unfortunately, the strict security requirements of CIG raised havoc with the plan for assimilating the ID personnel into the

DB structure. More than two thirds of the SDS/GMDS civilians failed to pass the CIG security clearance. This proved to be a source of embarrassment to the War Department which found that it had employed on confidential projects people who could not be cleared by CIG standards. Since CIG Personnel and Administration (P&A) refused to take responsibility for informing these employees that they could not be cleared and could therefore not be employed by CIG, it was necessary for the War Department to terminate some of them and to find less sensitive positions for others. 62/

This was not the first such occurrence. The same problem had been encountered earlier in the year in connection with the transfer of military personnel in WDC when it was taken over by CIG. Most military personnel of WDC had been cleared for intelligence work of high security classification to the satisfaction of the War and Navy Departments' wartime standards. CIG's stricter requirements were quickly reflected when "waivers" were sought in vain for certain personnel not meeting citizenship or other requirements. The chief of the Security Division, CIG, noted in January 1947 that an exception in the case of Documents Branch might be possible but advised against it because of the difficulty in discharging undesirable individuals once hired. 63/ The security problem was eventually

worked out and the crisis passed, but in view of the precarious personnel situation in DB and the difficulty in securing trained and knowledgeable intelligence officers and linguists, this development was an extremely unfortunate one from the standpoint of DB operations.

The transition from military to civilian control continued, and pending the SDS/CMDS move to DB, changes in DB leadership and structure were initiated. During the short period it was under Navy control in 1946 WDC had been headed by Cmdr.

Mark T. Little. His deputy was an Army officer, Maj. William B. Pohlman, former chief of PACMIRS. By December John J. Bagnall, a former Naval officer and now DB Executive Officer, was serving as acting chief in the prolonged absence of Cmdr. Little. The formal relief of Little as Chief, DB, was announced on 28 February 1947 and the same memorandum formalized Bagnall's position as acting chief, effective 1 March. 64/ A short time after, on 13 March, he was named chief. 65/

The appointment of Bagnall to head the CIG document exploitation operation was, at this point at least, considered to be only a temporary assignment. During March 1947 the Office of Personnel and Administration began compiling a list of all positions in CIG which were to be considered "key positions." This survey was conducted in order to inform

member agencies of IAB which positions were being occupied by military, naval, and State Department personnel. 66/ The following month Gen. Sibert, AD/O, submitted a number of lists of key personnel assigned to positions in the Office of Operations and in the forwarding memorandum he referred to his search for an Army officer to become chief of DB at the time that SDS and GMDS were to be taken into the organization. 67/ This matter was advanced further in July after the two sections 25X1 had been absorbed when Deputy Assistant Director of Operations (DAD/O), designated several slots as key positions and suggested they be filled by Army, Air, and Navy Department personnel. The positions, their suggested grades, and the service of assignment included chief of the branch (P-8) to Army, chief of the branch's Far Eastern Division (P-6) to Navy, and chief of the Scientific and Technical Division (P-6) 25X1 to Air. was then under consideration by the AD/O as a candidate for the position of Chief, FDB. 68/ 25X1 was actually appointed to this position later on in 1947 and held it for approximately a year, but this was the extent of the assignment of "key positions" to the military. The increasingly civilian-oriented complexion of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), which replaced CIG in September 1947, was reflected in the make-up of its document exploitation facility.

As part of the adjustment to DB's new functions and subordination the branch entered a period of experimentation which
resulted in a number of changes in its organizational structure.

None of these alterations was profound; they were instead readjustments designed to seek and obtain greater efficiency. To
a large degree they were in response to changing requirements
from the intelligence community but this was more true later
on than at this time. In 1947 it was more a matter of the
organization getting its house in order to meet new challenges
than anything else.

A tentative T/O was submitted on 4 December 1946 which differed slightly from that adopted by WDC the previous August.\*

The position of Operations Officer was dropped and Liaison and Control were divided into two separate offices. In addition, Screening and Editorial, heretofore units under Bagnall's old Research Section, were moved up and were themselves made sections. Total personnel under this T/O was set at only about two-thirds of which was filled. 69/ In a presentation of the WDC mission and functions on 17 December Bagnall submitted to the AD/O another T/O involving further changes in nomenclature

25X1

- 49 -

<sup>\*</sup> See p. 20.

and structure. By this move the Liaison Office was abolished			
and Administration and Control were designated, respectively,			
"Administration and Security Office" and "Control and Planning	·		
Office." The Editorial Section changed to unit status and,	• .		
with a new Service Unit, was placed under the Publications			
Section. The new T/O called for a total of persons.			
Against this Bagnall proposed that recruitment be initiated			
to bring the current assigned and on duty to a strength of	25 <b>X</b> 1		
<u>70</u> /	25X1		
Further T/O versions were submitted by DB on 2 and 12 May			
1947 calling for certain changes in nomenclature and for ex-			
pansion of the organization, 71/ but these were not approved.			
Then on 6 June Advisor for Management, sub-	25 <b>X</b> 1		
mitted one to the Assistant Executive Director and this was			
returned approved on 10 June. It provided for the following			
organizational changes:			
The position of Research Consultant in the Office of the Chief was eliminated.			
The Executive Officer was redesignated "Administrative Officer."			

The Publications Section was abolished.

Staff.

The Personnel and Administration Section was abolished and its functions integrated into a new Administrative

The new Document Source Survey Division, which had been activated earlier in the month, was approved.

The former research projects (A, B, C, D, and E), in conformance with their substantive functions, were consolidated and redesignated the "USSR and Satellites Division," the "Far East Division," and the "Scientific and Technical Division." 72/

25X1

The 10 June reorganization allowed a T/O of but the problems of security clearance referred to earlier made prospects of approaching even close to this figure extremely poor. The increased personnel demands for reproduction and publication constituted a large problem, and the branch was faced with increasing difficulties of recruiting and clearance against the ordered decrease of military personnel. The same held true in respect to securing qualified civilian personnel.

On 27 June 1947 Gen. Sibert officially announced the reorganization and redesignation of the Documents Branch. By this memorandum SDS and GMDS were transferred to CIG as of 29 June; Documents Branch was redesignated the "Foreign Document Branch" (FDB) and was to include the reorganized divisions and administration referred to above; and John Bagnall, Chief of Documents Branch, was appointed deputy chief and acting chief of the new FDB. 73/ With its new T/O of at the end 25X1 of June, FDB was operating with a ceiling and a complement 25X1 individuals on duty. 74/

- 51 -

#### SECRET

The date 29 June 1947 serves as an important bench mark in the history of CIG document exploitation. With its reorganization completed, the new branch had basically attained the structure and character with which it was to carry on its operations for the balance of its life. Many changes lay ahead, to a considerable degree in the branch's structure but more particularly in the nature of its functions and its developing relationships with the rest of the community. This would be especially so in the near future with the transition from captured document to current exploitation. In its essentials, however, the trend of development was fixed.

#### CHAPTER THREE

## New Approaches to Document Exploitation

#### A. The Move Toward an Exploitation Function

When it was integrated into CIG on 1 December 1946,

DB was performing as a documents processing center with the
bulk of 650,000 captured Japanese documents, the outgrowth

of the earlier WDC (Adv) survey, as its main source material.

This large volume of documentary material constituted the
chief contribution of WDC upon its incorporation into the
new organization. A small number of documents had also been
received from State, War, and Navy department channels and
about 10,000 documents per month, including newspapers
and periodicals, were being received at that time from the
current collection of G-2, SCAP, in Tokyo.

DB initially screened this material and segregated it into four categories, namely: items of immediate intelligence value; items of possible future value; items of interest to American industry (to be disseminated by the Commerce Department); and documents of no intelligence or industrial

interest. The latter were routinely forwarded to the Library of Congress. Based on this screening, DB prepared an average of 2,500 abstracts weekly from the captured documents and proceeded with a continuing exploitation of the material based on a review of these abstracts against the requests generated by the consumer agencies receiving the abstracts. When requested, summaries were prepared giving more complete information on pertinent material. Translations, in whole or in part, were also prepared to meet requirements submitted through OCD by consumer Offices. Documentary research, perhaps the most effective form of exploitation and the forerunner of what was to become the primary form of operation in the branch, was conducted on the basis of requirements for specific information which were answered by preparing the desired data in its most readily useable form. This might be in the form of cards, statistical tables or charts, extract translations from a number of documents, or studies combining the results of research in a subject unit. Thus, in December 1946 when the branch became part of CIG, the form of DB output consisted of the following materials: accession lists, summaries, translations, research projects, reports, and card files. There were at this time some 50 translations,

14 documentary research projects, and 350 accession lists in process. The backlog of documents awaiting processing amounted to 145,000. 75/

The organization in early 1947 had a potential of 31 different languages, ranging from such common tongues as German and Russian to the rarer Esperanto, Tagalog, and Urdu. As was to be expected with the recent conclusion of the Pacific war and the fact that the German-language oriented SDS and GMDS had not yet become part of the new branch, Japanese was the principal medium of exploitation at the time, but it was anticipated that all major languages and even many of the minor languages and dialects of the world would be exploited in DB in the future. The personnel then assigned to the branch formed a competent nucleus for the beginning of the work. 76/

The processing of the vast stock of captured documents in the immediate postwar period often seemed an insurmountable task, especially when one considered the large and increasing backlog of materials together with the thin ranks of competent personnel available to the intelligence community to handle this load. Even then it was already recognized that captured documents as a continuing source of overt

intelligence had limitations. This was true because the backlog of available captured materials, large as it was in late 1946, would eventually come to an end; also, whether captured documents were available or not, the content of the materials was bound to become completely obsolete with the passage of time. Recognizing this fact and also aware of the potential loss to the country should the expertise in document exploitation developed during the war be permitted to dissipate, the intelligence community began early to give some thought to the future of document processing. With the eventual end of captured documents processing in view, the obvious answer was to place increased emphasis on the development of the exploitation of current materials. In this connection William A. Eddy, Special Assistant for Research and Intelligence at the State Department, on 25 October 1946 addressed a letter to Gen. Vandenberg urging his sponsorship of an interdepartmental meeting to consider the subject of foreign press and periodical exploitation as a source of intelligence information. Eddy cited the press and periodical analysis service provided by the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) during the war, a function subsequently discontinued because of personnel shortages. As opposed to the catch-as-catch-can operation

used then solely to meet the needs of particular departments, he suggested filling this gap by establishing a systematic monitoring service for the benefit of the whole community. He advocated re-establishment of such an operation on a centralized basis subject to the overall jurisdiction of an indepartmental board under the DCI and operated in or near the Library of Congress. Its chief benefit, Eddy opined, would be the elimination of duplication with its resultant waste of time and effort. 77/ The proposal was a farsighted, if obvious, one. Steps to coordinate community action on this matter were taken as early as 1948,\* but it was not until almost seven years later that the CIA document exploitation operation received official sanction as the intelligence coordinator for this function. Meanwhile, DB's services along these lines were developed internally, within the CIA structure.

Nonetheless, a start toward centralized responsibility for document exploitation was made. On 5 November 1946,
ICAPS sponsored a meeting to discuss the desirability of having 00 expand its collection activities to include foreign press and periodicals as well as the product of radio

<sup>\*</sup> See p. 75.

intercept. Although no concrete decisions were reached at this meeting, provision was made for further discussion of the problem by ORE, OCD, and OO. Consideration was also directed to a definition of the term "processing," presumably at the insistence of ORE. representing 00, made clear that it was the intent of his office to provide consumer offices not only with all raw material available, but to provide it in its most useful form for evaluation and analysis. 00, he declared, recognized that it was outside OO jurisdiction to make any analysis of the material collected. Its function was to be limited solely to a process of condensing the huge volume of material collected on a daily basis in order to effect a time-saving factor for the benefit of ORE. 78/ This aspect of "processing" or "exploitation" would in the future require further refine-The problem, a recurrent one, will be more fully treated on subsequent pages.

25X1 -

The opportunity offered by the State Department memorandum of 25 October and the subsequent ICAPS meeting in November was not wasted by DB. Once the disarray created by the shift of document exploitation to CIG control and the problems of establishing a work regime had been taken care of, John Bagnall, then Acting Branch Chief, turned his

- 58 -

### SECRET

attention to defining the DB mission in terms of the suggestions offered by the State memorandum. Addressing the AD/O, he pointed out that DB would complete processing of the present backlog of documents, aside from current Far Eastern publications, by the end of 1947. He further stated that currently some 7,500 foreign-language periodicals and newspapers were being received by the State Department for distribution to various government agencies, including at least 4,000 periodicals of intelligence value. It was an obvious fact that a single periodical contained a variety of information, only part of which was of interest to the agency receiving it; as a consequence, much of the remaining information was lost to other agencies due to a lack of centralization. He therefore requested that DB be authorized to amend its defined functions so as to receive and process current foreign periodicals and to make available to the community all intelligence information contained in them. 79/ With its linguistically and substantively trained personnel the branch was well organized to carry this out. The request contravened an earlier definition of DB functions which had prescribed DB exploitation of documents "with the exception of current material." In a follow-up memorandum two days later, Bagnall devoted a lengthy paragraph to his definition

of the term "processing" as employed in the earlier message. 80/

On 2 April, Gen. Sibert, the AD/O, proposed the gist of the Bagnall request for current exploitation in a memorandum to the Chief, ICAPS. This amendment of DB's functions was, however, to apply only to periodical exploitation, and handling of the daily press was specifically excluded. Sibert further suggested that OCD make arrangements for DB use of periodicals on temporary loan from the Library of Congress and other depositories and also proposed that DB receive cooperation and advice from ORE on requirements and reporting format. 81/ Formal approval of the plan by higher authority was forthcoming on 17 April with the provision that, for the present, periodical coverage would pertain only to the USSR and the Far East. 82/

17 April 1947

The immediate outcome of these exchanges was the publication of the first formal DB report under the new arrangement.

This was the so-called *Periodical Abstracts*, first issued on 2 April 1947 under the customary DB format. This format consisted of items consecutively printed on a page. The report in this style was discontinued on 23 June after only five issues, but it was resumed in July as a report divided into two parts and published as "Scientific" and "General"

abstracts. A revised format was adopted which entailed publication of the abstracts in card-cut form, eight to a page, with about 120 entries in the average issue. The "General" abstracts report was initially issued on 12 September and continued for a little over a year but was then discontinued on 9 November 1948 in favor of new information reports series. The "Scientific" abstracts report, first published on 6 August 1947, survived two brief suspensions, being revived each time by consumer demand, and continued in existence for a considerably longer period of time.

Then when SDS and GMDS were incorporated into the new unit in mid-1947, the branch, redesignated the Foreign Documents Branch, inherited the functions of these two organizations, including continuation of an SDS survey project on USSR railroads, collection of material for the Industrial Card File, and the cataloging of GMDS information for the Intelligence Catalogue. SDS had, on a limited scale, also conducted some press exploitation for extracting industrial economic data.

This, then, constituted the body of the exploitation program of FDB in mid-1947 during the period of transition from captured document to current exploitation. To repeat, the move toward greater emphasis on current material with

the expectation that this would eventually become the sole target of FDB operations was logical and inevitable. But while the goal of "currency" had been stated and approved, the functions of the branch continued, at least for the time being, to be carried out in the same slow and unwieldy manner as before. To remedy the situation John Bagnall in July 1947 forwarded to the AD/O a proposal which he termed a "Dynamic Approach to Captured Document Exploitation." This new plan, in essence, involved the development of a comprehensive informational plan which would result in a spontaneous production of useful and needed information through document exploitation. Under the existing method, FDB prepared and issued thousands of abstracts from the large backlog of war documents which were rapidly aging and losing their value. The intelligence community, almost completely absorbed in current intelligence-indeed, requirements being received by FDB ran two to one for current informationfound only occasional abstracts of captured documents of sufficient interest to request exploitation. Consequently, the development of basic intelligence information from foreign documents was dependent on haphazard, piece-meal requirements. This method was time-consuming, wasteful, and very inefficient. It was not even logical. Bagnall therefore

proposed that consumer offices place greater confidence in the qualified personnel of his branch and grant them an increased degree of responsibility for selective document exploitation. To carry out the plan he suggested that a detailed overall set of requirements on the USSR and Far East be drawn up by ORE, the primary FDB consumer; that intraarea priorities be assigned for the development of specific basic information; that accession lists of captured documents be discontinued; that accession lists of only current material be issued; and that FDB undertake as a basic program the spontaneous development of information from available captured documents according to the ORE requirements and priorities. He stated that the basic program would not handicap action on current requirements but rather would provide a sound foundation and a constructive, logical approach to foreign document exploitation. 83/

The Bagnall proposal, the thrust of which was incorporated later in the month in the ICAPS survey of OO,
was an important harbinger for the future development of
FDB operations. An indication that it had found favor at
least insofar as OCD was concerned was received on 1 August
1947 when Capt. Olsen, the AD/CD, spoke in favorable terms
of the Bagnall memorandum. He stated that action on all but

the publication of current accession lists rested within the present authority of CO, ORE, and CCD and expressed belief that a dynamic exploitation program would result in better service and more valuable information to the intelligence community than would be the case under the old system. 84/Regarding the establishment of overall detailed requirements, Olsen indicated that by order of the Executive Director a survey on this would be made. 85/Based on these developments, FDB's operations and service to the other offices had progressed to such an extent that by the end of the year Sibert was able to inform Olsen that the receipt of large numbers of requirements from ORE and the issuance of CCD's "Estimates of Intelligence Target Potentials" had given FDB sufficient information to warrant cancellation of the then still-pending survey on requirements. 86/

A further development in the FDB mission during 1947 was the augmentation of the branch's translation service function. This new move was largely attributable to the component's staffing problems.

Following informal liaison, the Office of Special Operations (OSO), CIG's covert Office, on 28 August 1947 requested FDB assistance for translation of approximately 120 pages per month of documentary material in various

languages. The serious personnel shortage of FDB was considered in relation to the possibility of seeking a ceiling rise (from 170), and establishment of a "translation pool" was suggested. 87/ However, the Acting Chief, FDB, declared that the branch could handle the OSO request with available personnel and turned down the suggested increase as unnecessary. 88/ In view of the frequent requests for branch personnel augmentation in the years following, this stand seems surprising and was perhaps one of the few times, if not the only time, that John Bagnall disregarded such an opportunity.

A time for second thoughts on the personnel problem soon followed, for in the ensuing weeks and months the demand for translations from requester offices, not only in CIA (which replaced CIG on 18 September 1947) but in other IAB agencies as well, increased rapidly. The problem of furnishing service for these requests now had to be squarely faced, and with the increasing workload it was no longer a question of whether it could be accomplished but rather how large a personnel complement would be required to do it. At a 14 October OO staff meeting the matter was thoroughly discussed and the old issue raised of whether FDB should establish a translation pool or whether the branch itself

should serve as a CIA translation service. 89/ 00 and FDB opted for the first choice and on 6 November 1947 the branch was authorized to establish a central translation service\* for CIA which was designated the Translation Service Division 25X1 (TSD) of FDB. 90/ In implementing this move, on 21 November submitted to the CIA Executive for Administration and Management a tentative T/O which provided for a total complement for the new division of 86 individuals, 67 of these to be linguists and the balance support personnel. 91/ A subsequent revision cut this total to 44, including 37 linguists, and final approval was granted on 26 December. 92/ 25X1 Addition of the new division brought the FDB T/O to To circumvent the long delays caused by clearance procedures and to get the new unit operative as early as possible, it was decided to segregate the Translation Service Division with its assigned linguists awaiting clearance from the already-cleared FDB employees, and arrangements

<sup>\*</sup> The definition of FDB's function as a central translation service was updated in late 1951 and reissued on 12 January 1952 as CIA Regulation One change, among others, incorporated in the new version was the right of the organization to reject requests (as a safeguard against indiscriminate dumping).

were therefore ma	ide to provi	de space	on t	the fir	st floo	I
of		for	the	use of	newly	
recruited linguis	st personnel	for TSD	•			

25X1

The recruitment of qualified linguists for FDB operations was and remained a chronic problem and will be more fully treated below. It also affected TSD in that the T/O for the unit was maintained only with difficulty. However, the unit proved its value by enabling the immediate use of new personnel, thereby doubtless saving for FDB many of the new people who otherwise, discouraged by the long drawn-out security clearance, might have sought employment in less sensitive agencies. Perhaps TSD's primary draw-back was the lack of direct communication between the "temporary" TSD employees and FDB.

The unit continued as a division of FDB until August 1949, when it was eliminated in a branch reorganization. Its functions and personnel at that time were distributed throughout the area branches; this allowed for broader and more efficient use of its resources.

Already in May 1947 the spectrum of FDB operations had been broadened beyond CIG limits by a CIG move to coordinate foreign press exploitation among the various agencies of the IAB through the pooling of effort to ensure better coverage suited to the particular requirements of each participating agency. Capt. Ford, the Executive Director of CIG, requested copies of all standing collection directives covering foreign press exploitation conducted by the IAB agencies and proposed a study on the overall problems of efficiency and economy. 93/

FDB activities and contacts were still further expanded in this period by continuing and extending the wartime arrangement which SDS had maintained with the British in connection with the SDS-produced ICF cards.

with the SDS-produced ICF o	ards.	25X1
		25X1
	In support o	
the argument for US coopera	tion, Gen. Sibert pointed ou	t
to the DCI that the USSR pr	ovincial press was a valuabl	e
source of industrial inform	ation not generally available	e in
the Soviet central press.		25X1
<u> </u>		25X1



25X1

## B. First Try for a Charter

With the function of FDB as an "exploitation" organization now apparently authorized, the way seemed clear for a gradual shaking down of the branch into a routine of document handling. However, the new procedure did not deal with and thus had not solved the matter of carrying on the continuing involvement of FDB in its original basic function, namely, that of providing translation services to the community as these related to current sources.

There was in this early period still no charter for implementation of FDB's operation as a "service of common concern," in straight translation as well as in exploitation. Now, concurrent with the development of the exploitation function, the branch took steps to solve this second problem.

As has been shown above, practical steps were taken to deal with the large volume of translation requests levied on FDB by the intelligence community, but what had been done in no way solved the nagging problem of ultimate responsibility for translation exploitation in the community — whether

## **SECRET**

this was to be a function of each agency on behalf of its own needs or whether it was to be a centralized operation handled by CIA, that is, FDB. By provision of the proposed DCI Directive 1/5 mentioned earlier, under authority of National Security Council Intelligence Directive (NSCID) 1, the exploitation of all captured documents and current periodicals and press, together with appropriate dissemination and coordination of related activities, was to be the function of CIA. 99/ Consideration of that directive was part of the general review by the National Security Council of all former National Intelligence Authority (NIA) and CIA directives which was initiated at the first meeting of the NSC on 26 September 1947. Clarification of the FDB mission would apparently depend upon an IAC or NSC decision relative to the so-called implementing supplement 1/5.

Meanwhile, in the fall of 1947 action had begun on preparation of a new NSCID 8, which was in effect the first effort to draft a charter for foreign document exploitation in the intelligence community. After considerable discussion and revision, a proposed version of this document was circulated on 13 January 1948. Like the Director of Central Intelligence Directive (DCID) 1/5, it provided the DCI with authority to exploit captured documents and current materials

for the benefit of the community. 100/ The 13 January version of the new directive was not viewed favorably by FDB, and on 29 January Chief of FDB, forwarded to Gen. Sibert a detailed critique of the proposed directive in which he dwelt especially on its restrictive nature, emphasizing in particular the lack of clearcut authority of the DCI in the matter of document exploitation and also the limitation of the field of exploitation exclusively to governmental agencies. 101/ As a result of objections, as well as some by the Army, which had been the originator of the initial request for an NSCID, still another version was prepared in early March 1948 by 00 and circulated by ICAPS for consideration by the Intelligence Advisory Committee (IAC) agencies. The stumbling block this time was the State Department, which felt that exploitation should be conducted on the basis of prior agreements between CIA and the requesting agency in all individual instances. CIA believed this arrangement to be too cumbersome to be workable and thus impractical. In view of the State position, CIA felt that issuance of an NSCID at this time would serve no useful purpose. 102/ Consequently,

25X1

25X1

ICAPS recommended to the DCI that the proposed NSCID 8,

"Foreign Document Exploitation," be abandoned and that this

work continue to be done by working level agreement under NSCID 3, "Coordination of Intelligence Production." 103/
This development brought to a close the first phase of the effort to create a charter for FDB operations. From a practical standpoint its lack did not deter the branch from performing its functions effectively; however, it is doubtless true that under the aegis of a charter many of the problems which subsequently arose could have been much more easily resolved than was the case.

Despite this setback the Agency continued to promote the concept of centralized exploitation and translation. The logic of this effort was well expressed by in reacting to the NSCID 8 failure; he pointed out that surveillance of the press could not be successfully done in a haphazard, sporadic manner and that coverage had to be complete and continuous, so that nothing would be overlooked. Those in the IAC opposed to the directive who expressed the feelings that proper exploitation could be done in the various embassies, by military and naval attaches, or by individuals assigned to the proper area desk in the appropriate agency in Washington were, he felt, under a misapprehension as to the enormity of the language problem as well as the large volume of material to be handled. 104/ In this was quite right. The

25X1

25X1

- 73 -

# **SECRET**

coordination of all governmental foreign documents exploitation and translation could only be done in a really effective manner by establishing a central point to exercise control, whether in CIA or some other agency. Logically this focal point appeared to be FDB by reason of its function and development. A proliferation of the same activity by the various members of the IAC, not to mention other divisions of the government, spelled at best inefficiency, duplication, and wastefulness; at worst, chaos.

In August 1948 George Carey informally learned of a proposal for creation of two separate translation pools in the government, one an Air Force project known as "Treasure Island," the other a central translating group for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. He pointed out the obvious fact that lack of an NSCID opened the field of foreign document translation legitimately to any IAC member who wished to enter it. 105/ This information about the new proposal triggered early CIA action. On 3 September, calling attention to the above developments, the Agency invited IAC member participation in a meeting to explore, as it pertained to intelligence materials only, the degree of interest in the IAC for establishment of a central document exploitation and translation service as envisaged in Paragraph 7 of NSCID 1. At

the same time the Agency expressed its willingness to maintain such a service provided all IAC members cooperated on the basis of certain prescribed rules. 106/

FDB was fully involved in the CIA planning, and, with Bagnall representing the branch, the Agency held discussions with ICAPS regarding the feasibility of a central translation and exploitation unit for foreign-language documents. These evolved two months later into discussions concerning the agenda for an IAC ad hoc committee which was to consider a centralized translation service. At that time Bagnall submitted a memorandum to ICAPS through the AD/O outlining FDB's position relative to the discussions and recommending use of FDB to process all non-covert foreign-language materials for CIA as an inherent function. 107/

The 3 September initiative of CIA bore fruit by the end of 1948 with the formation of a committee composed of representatives from all IAC agencies which was designated the Ad Hoc Committee on Central Translation. Although of relatively short duration, this body represented the first in a series of what may be termed "watch dog" or "guidance" organizations within the intelligence community whose overall function was to oversee all aspects of foreign language document handling. As such, it and its successors

played a very important role in FDB activities from this time on. The new organization's first meeting, called at the behest of CIA, was held on 10 January 1949 and concerned itself with a three-part agenda, as follows: translation being done by present agency staffs and by CIA, translation being done by contract outside the community, and translation desired but not being done due to shortage of staff or funds. 108/ A participant in this and subsequent meetings of the group was John Bagnall, once again the Acting Chief of FDB following the transfer of to another assignment in October 1948.

25X1

As a result of the first meeting of the new Ad Hoc Committee, together with attendant staff work, a report was submitted to the DCI in March 1949 presenting a concensus of the committee members' views on document handling. Briefly stated, it was their opinion that a really centralized translation bureau would be too complicated and too unwieldy; that individual intelligence agencies needed their own translation sections for limited amounts of priority special-interest material; that desirable coordination could be accomplished by maintenance by CIA of a central file of translated intelligence material and periodic dissemination of a consolidated list of translations in process, completed,

and available from each of the agencies; and that a common service of exploitation of foreign language publications (collection, screening, and processing) would be desirable, not only for the IAC but others as well. Based on these views, the following recommendations were submitted: maintenance of individual agency translation sections; coordination by CIA of translation work accomplished by such sections; and establishment of a new committee, designated the "Committee on Exploitation of Foreign Language Documents," to study the problems on centralized exploitation, and to make recommendations through normal channels to the IAC. 109/ The 16 March proposals by the DCI based on the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations were promptly approved by the respective intelligence chiefs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force during April. 110/

The importance from the FDB standpoint of the developments just described cannot be overemphasized. Although a formal charter on foreign-language documents processing was still in the somewhat distant offing, here for the first time had been formulated an official declaration by members of the intelligence community recognizing the need for centralized handling, a problem still unsolved more than four years after the close of hostilities in World War II.

It was a step long overdue, for the nature of the source material with which foreign language documentation was concerned had by now drastically changed. Most of the captured documents had already been turned over to the Library of Congress and the National Archives.

Approximately 85 percent of FDB's workload at the end of 1948 consisted of current material, <a href="lill">111</a>/ and the time was not far distant when work on captured documents would be wholly exhausted. Important as well was the emphasis placed upon the distinction between "translation" and "exploitation," for with the growing volume of materials to be processed and the limited personnel to do this work, exploitation appeared to be the only method to cope with FDB's increased responsibilities. Straight translation, as the Director made clear, could be carried out as an operation of "common concern" only for other than normal needs. The statements in the IAC March declarations were broad and somewhat nebulous, but they were nonetheless a significant step forward in the delineation of FDB functions in relation to the overall intelligence field.

On 11 April 1949 the Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign

Document Exploitation, with John Bagnall as chairman, was
established by agreement of the IAC at the final meeting of

the Ad Hoc Committee on Translations. Its purpose, as defined by the DCI, was to assist and advise CIA on current IAC exploitation of foreign-language documents with a view toward eliminating duplication and achieving more complete coverage. 112/ The new committee and its successor organizations were eminently successful in accomplishing this purpose. From 18 April on, the Exploitation Committee met weekly until its last meeting on 25 July 1949. At that time it prepared a final report which included the following major recommendations for official IAC concurrence: CIA should assume responsibility for the overall coordination of foreignlanguage document exploitation and for performance centrally of necessary exploitation; a permanent Foreign Documents Exploitation Committee should be established to assist the DCI in the exploitation program; and appropriate instructions and directives should be formulated embodying the recommendations outlined. 113/ Together with this report, a redraft of a proposed NSCID, prepared by Bagnall at the AD/O's direction, was submitted for ICAPS approval, but it met the fate of earlier drafts. No final action was taken.

#### CHAPTER FOUR

## The People and the Organization

### A. Staff Development

With the gradual evolution of FDB from a group of largely dissimilar units engaged in the processing of captured enemy documents under conditions of war into a peace-time organization with an increasingly diverse and complex function, a state of change became the norm rather than the exception in the formative years. In this period, lasting from 1946 to about 1953, the concepts, objectives, organization, workload, personnel requirements, and methods of the branch changed drastically and were chronically in a state of flux. These changes were largely attributable to concurrent CIA growth and reorientation and to changing world conditions. Important, therefore, to the fulfillment of FDB's mission under such circumstances was the establishment and development of an organizational structure responsive to the needs of the intelligence community, but even more important was the recruitment and training of a competent, highly motivated staff of linguist-intelligence officers. As noted earlier, the branch

inherited an important nucleus of linguists at the time it was incorporated into CIG, but with the rapidly increasing workload as the mission emphasis gradually shifted to world coverage, the need for a sizable augmentation of the staff was foreseen and steps taken to bring it about. Unfortunately, the problem was not eased by the fact that changes in intelligence targets after the war, particularly the lessening emphasis on captured document processing, made the available language resources inherited by FDB less meaningful. In the war and immediate postwar period German and Japanese had, of course, been the primary exploitation languages; by the end of the 1940s and early 1950, as the Cold War atmosphere intensified, these languages were replaced in importance by Russian and Chinese and by the languages of Third World areas in which Communist influences were strongly in evidence.

In addition to the language problem, still another change affecting the FDB personnel situation was the growing emphasis on exploitation, alluded to earlier. This was a development created by the need to cover large and increasing volumes of source material with a limited cadre. Since it was possible to exploit — that is, translate selectively — considerably larger amounts of material than could be covered by straight and complete translation, it was logical to use the former

method. This procedure was eventually carried a step beyond the exploitation function when the organization began to conduct basic or, more properly, preliminary analysis through its production of collated reports. Thus, the nature of the FDB personnel complement was changing. From pure translation the branch engaged increasingly in the preliminary functions of analysis, that is, the selection of materials which would contribute to the final analytical solutions of intelligence problems. Nevertheless, despite the change to exploitation, translation work continued and, in fact, did so at an increasing rate. This aspect of the staffing problem also required consideration.

Since the time of the conversion from military to civilian control at the end of 1946, the problem of personnel shortages in FDB had been a chronic one. Some of the reasons for this have been discussed earlier. For example, the inability of some of the former WDC and SDS military and civilian employees to pass the much stricter CIG and CIA security clearance had resulted in their elimination; furthermore, the strict security requirements made recruitment more than usually difficult. Also complicating the problem was the desire of some individuals making the transition from military to civilian life to seek employment in other government

agencies or in non-government fields of endeavor. This reflected a wish on the part of some to find positions in which they could use their substantive talents in preference to their linguistic skills. For these and other reasons the personnel shortages continued and were a persistent drag on the capability of FDB to accomplish its tasks. Because of recruitment difficulties and the imposition of ceilings for hiring by the Agency, designed to hold the numerical employment within bounds of the organization's requirements, the tables of organization established for the branch were for the most part theoretical rather than actual.

Recruitment problems were unique for the branch as compared with many other parts of the Agency in that the ideal applicant for employment in FDB was required not only to possess a command of at least two languages, one foreign and the other English, but he was also expected to have a substantive knowledge of the area or field to which he was to be assigned. Such recruits were sought but were difficult to find, particularly in the face of competition from other units, in and out of the Agency, many of whom could offer higher grades to prospective candidates. Since the ideally equipped employee was hard to find, the branch settled on a policy of hiring a linguist when available and training him in the substantive

aspects of his job after he had entered on duty. In some instances FDB undertook to train a number of its own personnel in the rarer languages. Even to obtain linguistically trained individuals was not always easy, for it was only after the war that language training and language—area studies became an important part of the college and university curriculum. Thus, at the beginning, the competition for recruits was very sharp. Later on, as more language graduates entered the labor market, this pressure decreased somewhat.

Recruitment was conducted at many US institutions of higher learning, resulting in a constant flow of potential job candidates to FDD. In this connection contacts were established and cultivated with key faculty members, usually in language departments, who were encouraged to recommend prospective employees from among their students. This cooperation was as a rule freely and generously given. At times, the organization's ardor in pursuing this means of obtaining badly needed linguists led to complications. For example, in 1947, FDB promised jobs

Personnel Branch had interviewed them. In the interim

25X1

Personnel Branch had interviewed them. In the interim, certain positions had been downgraded and in some instances individuals failed the security investigation. As a result, some applicants accused the Agency of discrimination and

complained to their Congressmen, <u>114</u>/ creating an awkward situation. Eventually coordination among Agency components improved and such misunderstandings were generally avoided.

This discussion of the development of a document officer corps through recruitment and training leads to the question of what the typical FDD professional was like and what the nature of his work was. The term "typical" is difficult to apply to FDD officers. FDD personnel came from a diversity of backgrounds. They ranged in age from young, inexperienced individuals recently out of school, with only a modicum of language training, to middle-aged emigrees who spoke a native tonque and for whom English had until quite recently been a foreign language. While generally college graduates, the educational background of FDD employees also varied widely, from the high school level to the highest of graduate degrees. Their substantive backgrounds were equally diverse, ranging from, say, a history or political science discipline to one in mathematics or physics. They were assigned within the division according to their qualifications and were then, by work experience, trained in the specifics of their jobs.

A typical work regimen usually consisted of assignment to the employee of selected foreign press and journal sources of a particular country, supplemented from time to time by book and monograph material. These were regularly scanned, significant articles or selections were extracted on the basis of periodically updated consumer requirements lists, and the selected material was translated or summarized either in-house or was sent out for translation on contract. The results of these labors eventually evolved as periodically issued reports. On frequent occasions, specific requests were received from consumer offices and these were exploited as required. In addition, qualified FDD officers would engage in special tasks, some of which will be treated below, but in general the routine described above was their typical daily job.

The difficulties encountered in recruitment applied not only to professional people in FDB but were also evident as regards clerical personnel. Here the problem was primarily one of competition with other parts of the Agency for a commodity in short supply, although in this instance the security clearance aspect was also a factor. There are numerous references in FDB personnel reports of the period which emphasize the acute shortage of clerical personnel. The critical aspect of this shortage was the disruption created in the production of the finished FDB product once the research and translation had been completed. In August 1947, for example, it was reported that the shortage of clerical personnel in the

Editorial Section of FDB had limited production to only
45 percent of the material received during the month, <a href="https://doi.org/10.115/">115/</a>
and during the following month, of eight issues of the FDB

Periodical Abstracts prepared, only one was issued due to the
acute shortage of clerical personnel. <a href="https://doi.org/10.116/">116/</a>
Although these and similar instances were not the only reason for delays in FDB
output then and later, they were an exasperating contribution to the branch's poor reputation among consumers for slow dissemination of its production.

When the new Documents Branch became part of CIG late in 1946, CIG took cognizance of the need to strengthen its fledgling acquisition, and one of its first official acts relating to DB was to recommend an immediate increase in the branch's complement from 90 to 161 bodies. This was designed to effect a more efficient operation and to make a start on dissolving the large backlog. 117/ For the reasons stated earlier, the figure 161 proved an elusive goal. Indeed, with the endemic problems of recruitment and attrition, this figure was not reached until some two and a half years later.

Throughout its history there were, as one would expect, considerable variations in the T/O and ceiling levels applied to the branch (later, division). To cite these figures merely for the record would prove boring to the reader and

would serve no practical purpose. What is more important is to call attention to trends and changes in the personnel situation in the organization as these occurred and to direct attention only to changes in personnel levels which reflected significant developments.

The recommendation of 17 January 1947 for the DB T/O in-	
crease signalled the beginning of a rather rapid rise,	25X1
and by mid-1947 when SDS and GMDS employees were added to the	
branch the T/O level was fixed at 118/ This figure stood	25X1
until December when the Translation Service Division was added	
to the branch. After some maneuvering, a T/O allowing for a	
total complement of was established to permit the staffing	·25X1
of this division. Slight internal changes in the branch	
brought this figure up to 119/ A branch reorganization	25 <b>X</b> 1
resulted in the reduction for Fiscal Year (FY) 1949 to a T/O	
of $120/$ and in mid-1949, with discontinuance of the TSD,	25 <b>X</b> 1
this number was reduced still further, to 121/a level	25X1
which was maintained to the end of 1950.	

The branch ceilings, meanwhile, had roughly followed the convolutions of the T/Os. Up to the beginning of 1949 there was generally a differential ranging from approximately 25 positions to about 80. In early 1949 the ceiling finally overtook the T/O and from then on, with exception of lags as

T/Os were increased, the two figures were generally identical or at least close together.

Unfortunately, until approximately the final quarter of 1949 the same could not be said for the numbers of individuals on duty in FDB. Regardless of the number of T/O positions allotted to the branch or the ceiling established, recruitment continued to fall far short of meeting FDB requirements. With the increasing emphasis on the Soviet and Satellite areas, the shortage of Russian and East European linguists remained acute. For example, during the first three months of 1948 an average of 60 applicants had been under consideration at all times but the number of individuals hired remained discouragingly small. The majority were rejected due to language deficiency

	or were eliminated for security reasons.
and	,
This	

25X1

25X1

response was quite typical.

During its formative period as CIA's document center,

FDB was the frequent target of criticism by the intelligence

community for its apparent inability to meet the document ex
ploitation and translation requirements levied on it. The

various offices of CIA seemed to fail to understand the special

- 89 -

## SECRET

problems facing the branch in its recruitment program and showed a tendency to place FDB in the role of whipping boy for the problems rather than to attribute these to actual circumstances over which FDB had no control. The reason for this attitude is not quite clear although it may have been at least partially due to poor public relations on FDB's part and to a lack of meaningful communication among the parties concerned. Whatever the cause, FDB sought all possible means to extricate itself from a bad situation not wholly of its own making. Already in 1947 the Chief, FDB, had suggested that improvement in procurement of personnel might be effected if an FDB representative were allowed to contact foreign-language departments and foreign-language majors in various universities prior to the end of the academic year. In this way qualifications determination and clearance procedures could be carried out during the school year so that new personnel could go to work immediately upon graduation. 123/

In pursuit of solutions to the critical manpower situation, and John Bagnall met on 20 January 1948 with representatives of the CIA Personnel Branch. Two points were discussed — the location of new sources for recruiting language personnel, and the use of an unclassified typist pool as a means of holding clerical personnel until clearance was

completed. One outcome of the meeting was Personnel Branch's assurance that it would make a concerted effort to recruit linguists, first in the Washington area, and then through colleges and language schools elsewhere in the US. In addition, FDB was instructed to canvass present employees and forward to Personnel Branch all possible references. 124/ The employment of such recruitment practices became a standard means of securing new applicants for FDB and was applied with increasing success.

The second proposal, the formation of an unclassified typist pool, was also implemented. A pool for uncleared typists was established near the main operation but separate from it and proved very successful, both from the standpoint of assisting in the work of the established clerical force and of holding potential employees.

The search for solutions continued, but in February, in answer to a request for assistance from Gen. Sibert, the Executive for Administration and Management, placed at least part of the blame for the personnel shortage on FDB itself and cited 21 pending cases already in FDB hands for as long as a month where administrative action on FDB's part would have speeded up clearance and made personnel available. 125/ On the same day, Walter Ford, the Executive Director, continued

the attack. Referring to Sibert's contention that basic reason for the unsatisfactory personnel situation in FDB was the lack of adequate personnel procurement, Ford spoke of an approximate 30-percent turnover, by resignation or transfer, of personnel in FDB, a rate four-to-five times greater than that in other CTA units. To Ford this indicated the possibility of an unsatisfactory situation in FDB's internal management, and in view of this he declared his intention to initiate a combined management and classification survey of the branch. 126/

25X1

25X1

25X1

Sibert and took strong exception to the allegations				
expressed in these memoranda, and at Sibert's request				
prepared a six-page memorandum in answer to the contentions				
of and Ford. To refute the inference of sub-standard				
leadership in FDB, he went into person-by-person detail on				
reasons for the above-mentioned losses, and expounded at con-				
siderable length on the "peculiar" circumstances of FDB's				
inclusion in the Agency, namely, the fact that it was the only				
organization taken over by CIA that then had to be put on a				
peace-time footing. The "weak management" charge seemed to				
have touched a particularly sensitive nerve, and took				
pains to point to the large volume of intelligence produced				
by the branch since its activation despite the handicaps				

under which it labored. 127/ apparently made a good case in his memorandum defending FDB operations, for no further reference to poor management appeared in subsequent exchanges. A&M conducted the scheduled survey in the spring of 1948, but the results caused no furor, and 00, with minor exceptions, readily concurred with its findings. In retrospect the flare-up in February appeared to have been simply the result of a case of bad communications between Personnel Branch and FDB.

25X1

Meanwhile, the FDB work force was increasing in numbers and becoming more stabilized. Whether this was because of economic stress in industry in the United States and the resultant decrease in private employment, because of the return to this country of accomplished linguists formerly employed abroad, or because of a wider acquaintance with FDB's recruitment program by government agencies, a steady increase in the number of acceptable candidates was apparent during the first half of 1949. Though potential employees were still lost through failure to meet FDB requirements or through delays in security clearance, more qualified linguist—intelligence officers actually entered on duty in three months in early 1949 than during all of 1948. 128/ By this time the branch complement hovered in the vicinity of 150 individuals and in the succeeding months this

figure gradually moved upward. From mid-1949, when the T/O reduction had taken place, until the beginning of 1951, when it was once again increased, the number of FDB employees rose 25X1 and this trend continued. To carry the story from somewhat ahead, in mid-1953, following the promulgation of NSCID 16, the long-sought charter, the Foreign Documents Division (FDD), as FDB was by then called, achieved a personnel 25X1individuals. From that time on, complement in excess of and throughout the 1950s, the FDD personnel count remained 25X1 employees, and this generally static at approximately figure corresponded roughly to the T/Os and ceilings of this period. After 1953, there were no longer shortages in terms of the overall number of employees. If shortages did occur, they were usually in terms of language specialists within that number.

Returning, however, to the earlier period when FDB's rather sparse personnel was still failing to keep pace with the increasing requirements, several devices were adopted to help alleviate the situation. Early in 1948 the branch sought and received authorization to resort to what was termed an "overtime program" in an attempt to reduce the backlog of translations and later to provide for increased press and periodical exploitation and to meet the demands for

translation service. 129/ At the start, approval of Budget and Finance was required to authorize the needed overtime allowances for the branch, but with commencement of the Korean action in June 1950 and the beginning of a period of six-day work weeks, overtime became standard procedure. The degree to which this means was used to manage the FDB workload is evident from the following figures for hours of overtime: 1948 - 1,900; 1949 - 18,400; 1950 - 15,600; 1951 - 32,800; 1952 - 44,000. 130/ The "overtime program" served the purpose for which it was instituted but it was nonetheless an artifical expedient.

Other methods used or contemplated were the employment of qualified linguists called up for duty with the armed services and detailed to FDB, 131/ use of a provisionally cleared linguist pool, and authorization to recruit at 10 percent in excess of the T/O. So far as is known, the first of these was never implemented. The second had been standard operating procedure (SOP) for some time, but in December 1948 the Executive Director threatened to curtail it. On 7 January 1949, however, a memorandum from the DCI to the Executive Director, outlining FDB justifications, approved continued use of the pool. 132/ The third method, triggered by the AD/O's appeal for a small increase in the FDD T/O, resulted in no increase but did grant FDD authorization to apply the 10 percent

formula in recruiting, an important concession toward helping solve the personnel problem. 133/ In connection with recruiting, briefing sessions were initiated and held periodically to acquaint field recruiting officers with the division's needs.

The devices just described were helpful to a degree, but they were still not sufficient to bring relief to the beleaguered division. Faced with an estimated workload of some 98,764 pages of classified foreign-language material during 1951, George Carey on 5 December 1950, with the concurrence of FDD's consumer offices in CIA, requested an increase of 70 linguists and ten clericals in the division's personnel complement. This was designed to augment FDD's current capacity for translation of 20,000 pages a year. Aside from the fact that added personnel was actually needed to accomplish the mission, the request was also designed to sidetrack a threat to the integrity of FDD's function as a "service of common concern." OSO, the main requester for this large bulk of translation, and some of the other CIA Offices had suggested recruitment of their own linguists, and in the absence of any progress up to this time on the formulation of an appropriate NSCID, the threat to FDD was very real. 134/

Fortunately, the request for an increase, designated CIA Project No. 00-68-51, was approved by the Project Review Committee on 6 January 1951. On the same date another request, CIA Project No. 00-67-51, authorizing an additional two positions to service a new FDD Unclassified Translation Project involving the contractual translation of 37,000 pages of unclassified material was also approved. 135/ The latter was a completely new departure from the earlier function of FDD and had farreaching effects on its future procedures. It will be the subject of a later chapter in this history.\*

In a memorandum sent later in January, Carey informed Bagnall of his approval of the latter's request that the new employees be permitted to be used both for exploitation and translation. This was based on Bagnall's contention that employment of this combination for the new personnel would result in a higher morale among them than if the new people were subjected to the rather deadening routine of continuous straight translation work. This proviso was, however, granted only with the understanding that the quota of 90,000 pages of translation per year was to be met. 136/

With the large increment of 82 positions added to the FDD T/O at the beginning of 1951, bringing it to a total of

<sup>\*</sup> See Ch. Eight.

and with increasing success in recruitment, which had	25 <b>X</b>
raised on-board personnel from 186 at the time the new T/O	
became operative to at the beginning of the third quarter	25X
of 1952 when the T/O was again changed, 137/ it would appear	
that the division had reached a personnel level which would	
require little or no change for the foreseeable future. In	
actual fact this was not to be, and the relentless press of	
new requirements and the growing workload made another appeal	
for help inevitable.	

In June 1952 Bagnall submitted a request for new people based on current receipts of source material and on the estimates of the needs of various CIA Offices. Breaking down his request in terms of clerical personnel and professionals, the latter including analysts for press propaganda analysis work (a new operation being undertaken by FDD for the first time),\* Bagnall declared that 98 new positions were necessary and could reasonably be recruited in Fiscal Years 1953 and 1954. He therefore recommended a T/O increase for FY-1953 to 380 25X1 positions with a ceiling of 138/ The 98 total was a 25X1 considerable reduction from the figure of over cited by

<sup>\*</sup> See Ch. Eleven.

Bagnall in his memorandum as actually needed to do all the work, but even the reduced T/O request met with serious criticism from the Planning and Coordination (P&C) Staff in OO. The part most severely criticized was not the number of additional bodies asked for but rather the statement that these could be "reasonably recruited." Louise Davison of P&C Staff pointed out that the net gain of 56 new recruits in the previous 18 months (January 1951 - June 1952) amounted to an average of 3.1 per month, a rate which would require to the end of FY-1955 to obtain 98 people. 139/ A re-examination of priorities and recruitment probabilities resulted in scaling down Bagnall's request from 98 to 62, including a reduction in propaganda analysts from nine to seven, and bringing the final 25X1 This T/O was approved on 22 September 1952. 140/ total to This figure was the highest ever attained by FDD. In the fall of 1953 it was reduced by 13 and in 1954 by ten more. From that time on throughout most of the 1950s the FDD T/O remained range, but in the 1960s it was gradually reduced to 25X1 in the 25X1 the and then to the range. 25X1

# B. Training

A factor of utmost importance in the development of a competent staff in FDD came into play, as it would in any

- 99 -

## **SECRET**

organization of this nature, after the process of personnel procurement had been essentially completed. This factor was the training of the new recruits for the job that they were expected to do for the duration of their careers with the division. In FDD, perhaps more than in most parts of the Agency, this process was unique in that it involved the necessity to train individuals entering on duty in the division to perform a dual function. As we have noted, procurement of personnel for FDD concentrated on obtaining individuals with a linguistic background. This in itself created difficulties, particularly in the early years, in that the labor market for this type of individual was limited and the competition both within the government and with private industry for good linguists was exceedingly keen. FDD was, of course, fortunate in that it had inherited an excellent nucleus of accomplished linguists when its wartime predecessors were absorbed by the Agency. This nucleus proved to be a valuable platform upon which to build the type of organization that was foreseen when the transfer was effected. However, the new group in its initial stages was small indeed and the job of creating a viable and productive organization proved to be a formidable one. Contributing to the difficulty was the inevitable and recurrent factor of attrition, for various reasons, which

was and continued to be an irritant factor throughout the life of the division. It was not an uncommon phenomenon to employ a promising candidate, train him in his job for many months, have him gain long-term experience, and then lose him to what to him seemed greener fields.

The fact that individuals had been hired and slots occupied did not mean that the problem had been solved. was only the beginning. Knowledge of one or more foreign languages did not mean that the new employees were ready to fulfill their function and that the division could leave them to their own resources. They had to be trained and given careful quidance in order for them to exploit their capabilities for the greatest benefit to the organization. The unique nature of their employment in FDD came into play here. They were expected to be not only linguists but area specialists as well. While it is true that some recruits, but relatively few, had received such dual training in the area studies courses becoming popular after the war in the nation's colleges and universities, the majority had not. Even for the few so educated, the special nature of intelligence work required a type of preparation not available in a college department. This was also true of academic training solely in languages since these courses usually prepared the students as generalists

rather than as the linguistic specialists that the intelligence community needed.

A related problem was the limitation of college offerings in the rarer languages and dialects needed by CIA. Training in many of these was simply not available on the outside, and special classes therefore had to be set up in the Agency to provide these capabilities. Fortunately, the major languages sought for intelligence work, Russian and Chinese, were becoming increasingly available.

The variety and methods of language training as it affected FDD employees ranged widely. There was first of all the "on-the-job-training" nature of his employment whereby his knowledge of the language with which he entered on duty broadened through experience to the extent that he became an expert in it and in the specialized vocabulary associated with his field. Another method, the most prevalent, involved full- or part-time enrolment in language classes sponsored by the Office of Training (OTR). If OTR did not offer the language, the employee could be sent for training to another agency such as the National Security Agency (NSA) or the State Department's Foreign Service Institute, to one of the universities in the Washington area or elsewhere, or to a commercial language school such as Berlitz. Sometimes, for

special cases or critical needs, external language training involved sending the employee abroad for as much as a year of study in a foreign university. In instances where training in given languages or dialects was not available elsewhere and a teacher could be temporarily recruited on the premises, courses would be set up and training provided in FDD itself. Such instruction was usually of the tutorial type, a method which proved especially useful for FDD purposes since it enabled the division to adapt the instruction to fit exactly the needs of its type of work and thus reduce to a minimum the time necessary to prepare actual producing linguists. On infrequent occasions individuals from other parts of CIA requiring language preparation were permitted to participate in FDD-sponsored courses.

Language training was not limited solely to professionals. Classes in elementary Russian for the benefit of clerical and screening personnel were started in 1951 and conducted periodically thereafter. This course proved very helpful in familiarizing support personnel, not normally language-oriented, with at least the rudiments of Russian and thus helped them do a more effective job.

The detail involved in providing language training for FDD personnel early became so great that provision was made to

plan and regularize all facets of the program, and in June 1952 was assigned to the newly approved post of Language Consultant on the staff of the Chief, FDD. 141/ 25X1 9 January 1953, was formally designated as Coordinator of Language Training, 142/ a position he held until near the end of 1954 when the post was combined with the Lanquage Consultant Service to form the new Linquistic Support Staff.\*

25X1

The preparation of FDD intelligence officers for their jobs was by no means limited exclusively to language training. Like other members of the CIA community they had available to them all the pertinent courses offered by OTR, and many took advantage of these. | Some instruction, like the Basic Intelligence Course required of all new employees, was compulsory, but most courses were voluntary. Some segment of FDD was always in a training status, in a variety of courses which might range from a typing class to attendance at one of the armed services strategic intelligence schools or at a senior management course at some prestigious university. As in the case of language instruction, some of the non-language training participated in by its employees was FDD-initiated. For example, periodic courses on the techniques of report writing were

See Ch. Eleven.

conducted by a member of the FDD Editorial Section. For eight weeks in the summer of 1952 a series of seminars on Soviet history, politics, and economics was conducted for the benefit of 40 FDD employees by three experts in these fields brought in from the academic community. During a three-month period in 1954, 120 FDD officers attended a series of lectures on Marxism-Leninism given by the chief of the Propaganda Analysis Staff.

Other forms of training available to FDD employees were area familiarization tours, plant tours, and attendance at professional meetings. The first of these usually ran from several weeks to about three months' duration and enabled the more fortunate FDD intelligence officers — from among those employed in the "free world" areas of the division — to travel to parts of the globe as diverse as Arctic Canada and Africa, Scandinavia and Indonesia. This privilege, for obvious reasons, was not open to officers in the Soviet Bloc and Chinese Communist areas of FDD although some assigned to the latter did go to Formosa or Hong Kong.

The extent of FDD involvement in training is evident from a sampling of the division's training statistics. The numbers of individuals receiving some degree of training, internal or external, amounted to 200 in 1953 (up from 94 the previous

year), 143/166 in 1954, 144/ and 180 in 1955. 145/ This sample of figures indicates a broad use of the available opportunities by FDD officers and suggests a strong desire for self-improvement. (gr something)

### C. Organizational Development

Concurrent with the development of a staff of linguist/ intelligence officers and support personnel to carry on the work of FDB, there evolved gradually an organizational structure designed to permit the branch to conduct its operations and fulfill its mission in conformity with the designs and purpose of higher CIA authority. Since, however, the Agency itself was still in a state of flux in the early period, with its components often working at apparent cross-purposes and with their relationships with one another not yet fully defined, the task of FDB in relating to these stresses was oftentimes a difficult one. The failure to provide the much-desired NSCID, which would have authoritatively defined the branch's function and permanently fixed its place in the community, intensified the problem. Despite the lack of a charter, FDB rested its case on the general understanding and agreement in the CIA and, to a lesser degree, in the IAC that it constituted the "service of common concern" for document exploitation and

it proceeded to develop its own organization in a reasonable and logical manner according to existing circumstances. As these changed, FDB adjusted to conform with new conditions within the Agency. The result was a gradual shake-down period which lasted until roughly 1953, and the organization which had evolved then remained more or less stable for the next seven years until June 1960 when a consolidation of FDD components occurred.

The organizational structure of FDB, as it was established in mid-1947 following the acquisition of SDS and GMDS from the War Department,\* remained unchanged for only about six months. On 22 December 1947 the new Translation Service

Division with a T/O of positions was established and space 25X1 was cleared 25X1

the new division who were to be used there on unclassified materials pending clearance for work in the other divisions. The new component was to provide a central translation service for the CIA and, when circumstances permitted, the other IAC agencies. The scope of its capabilities was quite

<sup>\*</sup> See Ch. Two, p. 40.

broad; in 1949, for example, its translators handled 30 languages. <u>146</u>/ With the addition of TSD, FDB had five divisions.

The first change of major proportions in the FDB structure occurred some six months later. On 3 June 1948, the so-called "Sunshine Project," a field procurement operation initially conducted by CIA's ORE and involving a T/O of six positions, was taken over by FDB. More will be said about this project in the next chapter. Then, on 29 July, in response to requests for wider and more comprehensive coverage of sensitive areas, further changes were authorized. Three new divisions were added: the Document Screening and Reference Division, which assumed the duties of what had formerly been the Administrative Staff's Library Section; the Eastern European Division, which, with a newly designated USSR Division, represented a split-up of the old USSR and Satellites Division; and the Near East/Africa Division, a move toward expanded branch coverage. Appointed as acting chiefs, respectively, of the new divisions were

		25 <b>X</b> 1		
	continued as chief of the reorganized USSR	25 <b>X</b> 1		
Division.		25 <b>X</b> 1		
	remained as the respective chiefs of the Far East,	25 <b>X</b> 1		
the Scientific and Technical, and the Document Source Survey				

- 108 -

## SECRET

Divisions. In addition, the Control Section under the Administrative Staff was changed to the Records Section. 147/ It was felt that the new organization would put FDB on a more realistic and fundamentally sound operating basis.

25X1

25X1

25X1

During this period of change in FDB, there also occurred the shift in branch leadership briefly mentioned earlier. This involved the assignment of a field artillery colonel, to a tour of duty as chief of FDB. served in this capacity for almost exactly one year, from 20 October 1947 to 26 October 1948, and performed commendably in defending the interests of the branch. During this period of "military" leadership in FDB, John Bagnall, who had served as chief of the old Documents Branch and then as acting chief when DB was redesignated the Foreign Documents Branch, was was relieved in assigned as deputy. When October 1948 for assignment elsewhere, Baquall was restored as acting chief of the branch. On 14 February 1949, he was officially designated chief of FDB and then held this position for the next 15 years until he left FDD to become Deputy Assistant Director, OCR. His deputy during most of this period was Benjamin B. Cain, formerly of Contact Division/OO. Cain served in this position until his retirement from the Agency at the end of 1959.

- 109 -

The next major reorganization in FDB occurred in mid-1949.

This move was undertaken in the face of a reduction in T/O and ceiling from positions. As a first step, the

Translation Service Division was abolished and its personnel assigned to operational divisions in the branch in accordance with their individual language qualifications. 148/ This change, in effect, brought the exploitation and support (translation) functions into closer conformity with each other, thereby providing a better translation product through coordination with area specialists and also a diversification of activity for FDB personnel which resulted in an improvement in morale. From the consumer standpoint, nothing was lost; indeed, there was a gain in quality.

25X1

This reorganization also involved further readjustments and reassignments among the area branch personnel. It called for formation of a new organization to be designated the "Operations Division," but this name was subsequently dropped in favor of "Documents Control Division." The new unit combined the functions formerly assigned to the Documents Source Survey Division and the Documents Screening and Reference Division. A new Reports Division, to which were shifted the functions of the Administrative Staff's former Records and Editorial Sections, was also set up. 149/ Appointed as

chiefs of the new divisions were	(who had headed 25X1			
the Document Source Survey Division) as chief of the Documents				
Control Division, and as o	chief of the Reports 25X1			
Division. Both had been members of the old WDC.				
While this reorganization was pending, FDB was in the				
throes of a physical change. The impending transfer of the				
from CIA control had necessitated plans for				
moving the branch to a new location. Vario	ous sites were			
considered and as late as 23 June it was thought probable				
that this location would be 1155 Champlain Street, N. W., and				
a moving date of 1 July was expected. 150/ This proposal was,				
however, rejected and the new home finally selected for FDB				
was	25X1			
	in 25X1			
Northeast Washington. The site was a considerable distance				

Northeast Washington. The site was a considerable distance from the main area occupied by CIA, and this factor, isolating as it did the branch from its consumers, was to create coordination problems which would not have existed under more normal circumstances. The problem of maintaining effective liaison was a formidable one, and failure to fully solve it made FDB's service function much less effective.

The 1 July moving date was not met but the move was made later in the month and completed by 1 August with a

minimum of disruption in branch operations. Allocation of space in the new quarters had been made with the reorganization plan in mind. Upon approval of the T/O in late August, FDB was organized in the form which was to stand substantially unaltered for the next two years. One minor change did occur shortly afterward when, on 29 September 1949, the titles of the "former" Foreign Documents Branch and its component divisions were reversed by CIA order and the organization from then on was known as the "Foreign Documents Division." Its subordinate units were thereafter designated "branches." 151/

The large increase in personnel which was authorized for FDD to accommodate the increased demands of consumer offices for translation and which was reflected in the new T/O of 25 February 1951\* did not change the physical arrangements of the division since the new assignments were distributed in relation to the requirements levied on the various branches. However, a fourth wing of the second floor was taken over in May to provide space for the newly augmented branches. This expansion and one further on in October 1952 to meet the need for additional space when the FDD T/O was increased once again proved to be sufficient from then on to serve the

25X1

<sup>\*</sup> See Ch. Four, p. 98.

space needs of FDD.

Organizational expansion of the division had, however, not yet reached its limit and, concomitant with increasing demands for translation service, a new commitment in the exploitation field had to be made by FDD. At least partially due to the heavy workload and limited personnel as well as concentration on higher priorities, the division had up to this point performed no service to the community on Western European source material. In fact, the Chief, FDD had earlier answered a consumer requirement for such service with the statement that OO, in view of personnel restrictions on FDD and increased demands for service, had established a policy that FDD would not process information on Western Europe. 152/ In March 1951, however, as the result of a reorganization of the Office of Research and Reports (ORR) and increased Agency emphasis on Western European developments, that Office reversed its earlier position that coverage of Western European sources by FDD was unnecessary and requested that a unit for this purpose be set up. The reason given was that the language competence which ORR originally possessed no longer existed. 153/ FDD thereupon initiated action to establish a new branch and submitted a request for an additional 26 employees to staff it and to exploit the 200 newspapers and 3,000 periodicals

considered to be of potential value. 154/ However, in light of the T/O increase approved for FDD earlier in the year, the still unfilled overall complement of the division, and the so far unproved potential of the newly formed external translation project, the AD/O refused at this time to ask for additional personnel although he did request authorization of the proposed new branch to meet the needs of ORR. 155/ The result was the establishment, effective 27 June, of FDD's eighth branch, with designated chief 156/ and an initial T/O of 19, which was obtained by reducing three of the other substantive branches by this amount. 157/ Space to accommodate the new Western Europe Branch was already available by virtue of the recent expansion to the fourth wing of Y Building.

25X1

The recurrent problem of personnel losses among potential employees due to long delays in granting security clearances still plagued the division. Another attempt to solve it was attempted in April 1951 when FDD proposed employment of these people in an "unclassified translation pool" to work on unclassified materials while awaiting clearances. 158/ In addition to preventing loss of personnel, the plan had the additional benefit of providing a work force to assist in holding down backlogs in the large volume of unclassified translation

- 114 -

# **SECRET**

organization was similar to the old Translation Service

Division which had been discontinued some two years before;

however, it was not as formal and did not become an organized

part of the division as the former had been. The new

provisional pool was set up in early summer 1951 and space

for it was provided in a sealed-off part of the FDD area in

Y Building.

was transferred from the Ad
ministrative Staff and appointed the first chief of the un-

25X1

ministrative Staff and appointed the first chief of the unclassified pool. 159/ The pool remained active for several years and served well the purpose for which it was established.

With success achieved in its request for Western European coverage by FDD, ORR made a further pitch in November 1952, asking that Latin America be taken into the FDD exploitation program. This request was denied for the present because of other commitments, although Bagnall agreed to search for Latin American information on a regular basis in sources covered outside the Latin American area. However, the door was not closed to consideration of this expansion provided ORR could justify it and FDD could obtain the needed personnel. 160/For the moment nothing further was done.

While the division increased in size and its operations expanded, changes were also made on subordinate levels. To

- 115 -

#### SECRET

improve FDD capabilities, the area branches within the division were reorganized during 1952 to better fit their operations to those of consumers on a counterpart basis. This provided for greater specialization in subject categories. Emphasis on projects of a research nature also continued to grow. Through reports resulting from these projects an attempt was made to save the consumers' time in assembling scattered items of information and to conserve the linguists' efforts by concentrating production solely on material of value to the project, thus eliminating the wastefulness of literal and complete translation. 161/ At the same time, a restudy and reclassification of 188 linguist positions as of 7 May 1952 marked an attempt, and one that was a definite success, to build the confidence and morale of the operational personnel. The new ratings were intended to be commensurate with the increased responsibilities and greater specialization which had accrued to the positions held by FDD intelligence officers. Similarly, 23 clerical positions were reclassified as of 10 December providing for an expansion of duties in these positions and for greater flexibility in operations. 162/

The description of the staff and organizational development of FDD up to this point represents the status of the division just prior to the issuance of NSCID 16, FDD's charter of common service. It did not mark the end of changes and innovations in these aspects, for these continued throughout the life of the organization. More followed and they will be treated in turn.

### D. The Question of Subordination

An issue of considerable importance to FDD's organization in the formative years pertained to the question of who was to control the division. The Washington Documents Center, forerunner of FDD, was initially assigned to ORE. It has been suggested that this may have been done partially because of early staffing difficulties. In 1946, in the absence of an approved T/O for WDC, slots were borrowed from other Offices, and WDC personnel, among others, were carried against OSO or ORE T/O positions which they never held. WDC's assignment may also have been due in part to the active role played by ORE representatives in the early negotiations for the transfer of document activities from the military services to CIA. 163/ On 31 December 1946, however, a retroactive order was issued assigning WDC, effective 1 December 1946, to 00, which had been established two months earlier to supervise the Agency function of overt intelligence collection. This subordination remained in force until 23 December 1963 when the division was transferred to OCR. Despite the transfer of administrative subordination to OO, WDC (and later, DB and FDB) remained under the operational control of other CIA Offices. The 31 December order provided for close coordination by ORE and OCD to determine requirements and priorities for DB production, prescribed OC coordination with ORE to determine final disposition of exploited documents, and designated OCD as DB's point of contact with other government agencies. 164/

In January 1948, the National Security Council designated Allen W. Dulles, William H. Jackson, and Mathias V. Correa to investigate CIA and the national organization for intelligence. In the course of its survey the group studied FDB activities as part of OO operations, and in its report to the NSC on 1 January 1949 it recommended that the branch be incorporated in a proposed "Research and Reports" Division (subsequently ORR). This decision was based on a conviction that FDB's work could best be performed in close relationship with and under the guidance of the consumer agencies. 165/ NSC 50, issued on 1 July 1949, approved the recommended transfer. However, no action was taken and the question of FDB's subordination remained at issue.

The question of the continued existence of CO, and thus of its control of FDB, hung fire for a considerable length of

time after issuance of the Dulles Report. There was a general feeling among those reviewing the report that the common function of 00's three divisions, the collection of intelligence information from overt sources, had not been fully recognized by the committee, particularly in connection with the overlap of FDB operations with those of the Foreign Broadcast Information Branch (FBIB). 166/ Another factor militating against the transfer of the branch to ORR, after the latter's formation, was ORR's specialization in economic and geographic research. Since the other CIA Offices and the IAC agencies all had need of FDB's services, it was felt that the branch should not be controlled by just one of CIA's research units. To do so would tend to make document exploitation an adjunct of research and analysis operations for the primary benefit of a few rather than to facilitate its growth as the common-service collection organization that it was intended to be. 167/

In its comments on the Dulles Report in February 1949, ORE declared its disinclination to assume FDB's functions, provided the latter's services continued to be conducted in support of ORE. In view of the fact that FDB was basically "a source exploitation facility" involving a substantial library and reference function, the Office proposed that the branch remain in OO or be attached to the CTA Library. 168/

The latter part of the ORE proposal appeared to be the Agency choice when, in mid-1949, the DCI had considered the possibility of transferring the branch to OCD. 169/

Complications followed. NSC 50 had directed abolition of OCD and dispersal of its functions to other CIA elements. The NSC, therefore, in a 7 July meeting approved the recommendations in NSC 50, including the proposed transfer of FDB to ORE, and directed the CIA to carry them out. 170/ In the course of preliminary hearings on the CIA budget for FY-1951, representatives of the Bureau of the Budget stated their opinion that the branch belonged in ORE rather than OO. Thereupon, the DCI, determined to resolve the problem once and for all, requested the Management Office in December 1949 to initiate a study and make a recommendation of where best to place FDD. 171/

In the discussions during the fall of 1949, George Carey had vigorously argued the case for keeping OO in existence and retaining FDD in this Office. He pointed out the inconsistency of considering the division's transfer to OCD, an Office largely devoted to library and reference functions, and emphasized that FDD collected information rather than documents. He dwelt on the close relationship of the

division's collection function with that of the Foreign

Broadcast Information Division (FBID) and the Contact Division

(CD), FDD's companion divisions in CO. If strategic considerations dictated otherwise, however, and a change was inevitable,

Carey opted for FDD's transfer to ORE in preference to OCD. 172/

The problem pertaining to FDD's transfer elsewhere in the Agency appeared to be closely related to the concurrent disposition of FBID and CD. Contact Division had been destined for merger with the covert Offices and the Dulles Report had recommended the transfer of FBID to a new and primarily covert "Operations Division." The latter provision was, however, disapproved by the NSC six months later. For this and other reasons, the provisions of NSC 50 relating to the rest of 00 were never implemented and FDD remained under 00 administration. 173/

The issue of a possible transfer of FDD to OCD was briefly revived in the latter half of 1951 when William H. Jackson, at the DCI's behest, made a special survey of OO during the period 24 August - 10 November 1951. In a lengthy memorandum prepared in October and forwarded by the AD/O to Jackson, John Bagnall presented a detailed analysis of FDD operations in which he spelled out the dissimilarity of FDD and OCD functions. The gist of the memorandum was that FDD exploited

documents to produce raw intelligence whereas OCD's handling of documents represented a library and reference function, that is, procurement, storage, dissemination, and similar activities. 174/ The case presented by Bagnall seems to have contributed to Jackson's recommendation to maintain the status quo with respect to FDD.

The Jackson survey apparently put a final quietus on the question of FDD's subordination. From then on, the matter was no longer at issue and was not again revived until the 1960s when the transfer to OCR was consummated. This will be the subject of a later chapter. For the moment, however, let us consider in the next chapter or two the materials with which the staff and organization were concerned.

CHAPTER FIVE

#### The Sources

### A. Community Cooperation

Near the conclusion of World War II, as noted earlier, the acquisition and preservation of captured enemy documents became a matter of increasing concern to the intelligence community. To prevent the loss of this material through inadvertent or deliberate destruction and also to plumb sources which during hostilities had not been open to the intelligence organizations, a widespread search and procurement effort was initiated. This was an extensive undertaking, involving all the services. One of these projects was the effort of the WDC (Adv) team, discussed earlier, which functioned at the close of the war in Japan and during a six-month period selected and evacuated some 650,000 captured document items to Washington and also provided for the continuing flow of materials which served as the basis of WDC (later DB and FDB) operations until captured documents as a source gradually dried up. With the decrease in volume and value of this source, the

nature of intelligence exploitation slowly changed from its earlier stress on the old captured material to a new emphasis on current sources, and the procurement effort was revised to conform to the new need. In this form, it became an important and permanent part of the intelligence function.

The role played by FDD and its predecessors in source procurement represents, of course, only a small part of the total effort. In actual fact source procurement is primarily a library operation, intrinsically not part of FDD's functions. It has been, and is, engaged in by many parts of the government, non-intelligence as well as intelligence, IAC as well as CIA. Within the CIA it was a major function of what gradually evolved into the Office of Collection and Dissemination. FDD's interest in collection of source material was thus peripheral but, since the quality and quantity of its own product depended upon the same factors in source collection, its concern with the problem was nonetheless great. As the WDC (Adv) survey in 1945-1946 had illustrated, during the early period WDC, FDD's forerunner, had depended mainly on its own initiative for document procurement, but with its integration into the Agency, its source collection function was for the most part conducted through, or at least coordinated with, OCD. What

follows deals with publications procurement only to the extent that FDD was involved.

In the spring of 1947, during the formative period of Documents Branch, the move toward gradual conversion from the exploitation of captured documents to the exploitation of current publications was already underway. At this time the document status in the branch was as follows: the branch had on hand approximately 40,000 low priority documents to be screened and abstracted and about 5,000 captured documents a month were being received. Operations then consisted of screening and abstracting the material being currently received plus approximately 2,000 captured documents a week of the backlog. 175/ At this rate the backlog would last another 20 weeks. The number of current foreign language periodicals estimated to be available from abroad at this time was about 4,000, of which some 1,760 were from Eastern Europe, the Near East, and the Far East, the developing major target areas. 176/ It was therefore obvious that the volume of current materials was more than adequate to fill the void that would be left by the dwindling backlog of captured documents.

There were several methods by which these periodicals could be procured. The most promising was through the Serials Branch, Acquisition Division in the State Department. This

25X1 Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/10/16 : CIA-RDP05-01429R000100060001-5



unit acted on the basis of requests from any government agency desiring foreign periodicals and took steps to procure them at no charge to the requester for the service. The only expense entailed was the cost of the subscription itself. Another State Department source was its Reference Division, which had expressed its readiness to offer its sources on temporary loan to other government components. The same was true of the Library of Congress, which, in addition to receipts from the State Department, also received some periodicals by means of international exchange, gifts, or purchase. A fourth source was the Hoover Library, which received a number of USSR periodicals and had indicated a willingness to make these available at Stanford University for abstracting. Finally, all current Japanese periodicals were directly procurable from SCAP, Tokyo, at no cost to CIG. 177/ Current source procurement appeared to be no problem at all.

The importance of document procurement was recognized early when, in the branch reorganization of June 1947, the Document Source Survey Division was created. It was to play an important role in surveying repositories throughout the United States and the rest of the world to determine the existence and availability of foreign-language documents of actual or potential

intelligence value. In this connection a start was made in October 1947 when FDB, in coordination with Contact Branch of OO, began a survey of governmental and academic institutions to determine the extent of documentary material held by them which would be of value to FDB. This activity was subsequently expanded to include research foundations and private industry.

25X1

178/

The procedure established was to have an FDB representative in company with a Contact Branch officer visit an institution, check out the potential of its sources, and then establish a working relationship with a key person there who would be witting of the CIA representatives' activities. The system, almost without exception, worked well and was employed by the branch for as long as it was needed.

25X1

- 127 *-*

## **SECRET**



25X1

The CIA Library's role in FDD procurement operations was no less important although its function pertained more to the normal collection routine of source acquisition than did that of Contact Division and OSO. On occasion, however, this cooperation took a more direct form. For example, in the early years while the Library was in the process of building up its English-language holdings, it conducted surveys in various parts of the United States to ascertain the existence and availability of material of interest. FDD utilized this opportunity and, with OCD consent, had the Library representative check the same depositories for foreign-language holdings. 181/

In addition to procurement assistance inside the CIA there were also sources among organizations elsewhere in government. In the latter half of 1947, when FDB exploitation was shifting gradually from captured documents to current sources, arrangements were completed with the Intelligence Division of the War Department, the Library of Congress, the Office of Naval Intelligence, the Naval Research Laboratory,

the Smithsonian Institution, the National Research Council, Intelligence Acquisitions Division (IAD) of the State Department, and the Bureau of Mines for the loan of current periodicals of intelligence value from the Far East and the USSR to be abstracted by FDB. 182/

Among these non-Agency organizations providing procurement assistance for FDB in the early years, the most important was the Library of Congress. In practice, the arrangement was a two-way street, especially in the immediate postwar years, since much of the source material received from the war theaters was sent to the Library of Congress as final depository. In this connection, the Japanese Document Committee, WDC, decided at a meeting held in early 1946 to send directly to the Library of Congress all Japanese documents of a purely cultural nature. 183/Arrangements were subsequently made to forward to the Library much of the additional captured material following its processing by the intelligence agencies.

In respect to the flow of materials in the other direction, that is, current sources from the Library to FDB, some initial difficulty was encountered, but a meeting between Dr. Evans, the Librarian of Congress, and served to resolve the problem amicably. The Library at first refused to release any

25X1

documents, then agreed to a three-day loan period which proved impractical, but finally settled on a two-week loan agreement with FDB. 184/ This cooperation was carried a step further when, in the summer of 1948, FDB, with Library of Congress approval, sent a screening team to the Library to ascertain what books were of intelligence value in a backlog of 6,000 titles which had accumulated there. Specific items were selected and sent to FDB, where a bibliography was prepared for the benefit of the IAC agencies. 185/ FDD's collaboration with its procurement sources yielded significant results. the course of four years, 1948 through 1951, the division processed a total of about 674,500 foreign-language documents. Of these, the State Department furnished approximately 422,000, the Army 68,000, the Navy 9,000, other CIA Offices 128,000, the Library of Congress 41,500, and the Smithsonian Institution 6,000. 186/

As these figures indicate, the State Department very early took over the Library of Congress's role of principal supplier of sources for FDD. To a very limited extent the Department used screening teams, as for example the despatch to Korea in 1948 of such a team which brought back a small number of documents useful to FDB. 187/ Much more important were the

publications procurement officers (PPO) of the State Department. The significance of their contribution to the intelligence effort, and to FDD in particular, is readily evident when one considers that in FY-1952, for example, the PPOs, in conjunction with the State Department's Foreign Documents Branch, procured 180,000 foreign-language publications. This constituted 70 percent of all documents received by the intelligence community. 188/Because of their importance to FDD, it was standard operating procedure for all State Department PPOs to be briefed by the division prior to their departure for overseas posts. This arrangement was beneficial to both parties; it defined the PPOs' target more closely, and this, in turn, provided better service for FDD.

Until the spring of 1953 State had provided for full-time PPOs in London, Paris, Rome, Moscow, Berlin, New Delhi, and Hong Kong and part-time PPOs in about 25 other posts. However, the budget cuts referred to above had placed the entire program in jeopardy. By May the position in Rome had been abolished, the Moscow position had been vacant for nearly a year, and the Berlin PPO had been instructed to cease procurement in the Soviet Zone due to personal danger. Thus, by the end of FY-1953, only four of the full-time posts were active and it was anticipated

	SECRET	
•		•
•		
	that the budgetary situation would allow only three to be	
	permanently occupied during FY-1954. 189/ With exception of a	]
•		25)
	tion. 191/ This plan was approved by the State Department in	
	September 1953, 192/ but no change resulted.	
•	Periodically, consideration was given to the possibility	
		25X
· .		
. •		
,		
		-
•		
_		•

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/10/16 : CIA-RDP05-01429R000100060001-5

#### B. The Search for Sources

Following the transfer of WDC to CIG and especially after its reorganization as the Documents Branch in mid-1947, there began a series of survey and procurement trips made at varying intervals to repositories throughout the United States and the world which gave promise of yielding significant volumes of source material of value to the intelligence community.

In the spring of 1948, in connection with its search for domestic sources of foreign-language documents, FDB became involved in a procurement undertaking known as the "Sunshine Project," FDB's only field operation until the establishment of the organization's contractual field units in later years.

From FDB's standpoint the Sunshine Project was a shortlived affair, although it had been in existence for more than a year at the time the branch became involved. Inherited from ORE, the project had largely accomplished its original mission when taken over by FDB. However, OO and the branch had been interested in it from its inception because of its relation to foreign-language document sources.

The original intent of the project involved ORE's desire to examine the document holdings located at the Hoover Library of War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University in Palo Alto, California, for the purpose of surveying and screening

this material in connection with an IAC project on psychological warfare directed against the Soviet Union. As a first step Col. Edwin K. Wright, Executive to the DCI, Mr. Donald Edgar, Chief of ICAPS, and Capt. S. B. Frankel, Chief of ORE, had visited the Hoover Library during the period 2-6 December 1946 and reported on its large volume of Far Eastern documents, on hand and being received. They also commented on the assent of the library authorities to the group's proposal for establishment of a CIG research unit at the library to process Russian, Chinese, and Japanese documents for intelligence information. 195/

On 17 February 1947 Col. Wright requested the services of of Documents Branch as a Chinese area expert to screen the Hoover collection and make arrangements for transmission of copies of the target material to Washington. 196/

began his assignment on 10 March and for the next two and a half months made an exhaustive examination of the Hoover Library materials. He submitted three detailed reports on the results of his study.

25X1

25X1

25X1

Meanwhile, on 24 March Col. Wright, now DDCI, ordered the project to be set up under ORE and assigned to temporary duty with the research group in a screening capacity. 197/
Disagreement with this arrangement was expressed by John Bagnall.

- 135 -

In a brief note on 3 April he recommended that

withdrawn from the project for reasons relating to the fact
that his military rank was subordinate to the ORE civilian
supervisor at Palo Alto. Bagnall also stated his opinion that
screening of documents was the responsibility of Documents
Branch as a central service and should therefore be done by

DB. 198/ This sentiment was echoed by in his final
report. 199/ On 29 May he completed his work and returned to
Washington. With his departure direct OD participation in the
project ceased for the time being.

25X1

25X1

By the following spring, the Sunshine Project was beginning to approach the stage of diminishing returns from the ORE standpoint. While full exploitation of the Hoover collections had not been quite completed, ORE's specific mission of mining the material for information useful for psychological warfare had reached the point where added information on the subject could in future be supplied by new material available in Washington. Termination of the project by the end of FY-1948 was therefore recommended by ORE. 200/ This was followed on 4 May by Wright's order transferring the project, including personnel, equipment, and facilities, from ORE to OO. 201/ The transfer was consummated and six additional slots were

added to FDB's T/O and ceiling in June to accommodate the new personnel. 202/ Earlier, however, Bagnall had made a thorough survey of the project in its current status and concluded that continuation of the project, from an intelligence and management standpoint, was not in the best interest of the Agency. He pointed out that larger quantities of material which showed a better than ten-to-one ratio of greater intelligence value were being received in Washington but were not being touched due to lack of personnel. 203/ Bagnall's recommendation to close out the Sunshine Project, with concurrence, was forwarded to the AD/O by

a week later, 204/ and finally on 2 July the DCI approved the termination date of 30 September 1948 suggested by the AD/O. 205/

25X1

Discounting the benefits derived by ORE from the mission, the impact of the Sunshine Project on FDB was minimal. It resulted in a thorough review of the holdings available at the Hoover Library and in the preparation of bibliographic listings which made this information easily available to the intelligence community. Some of the material found there was important, but the bulk of it proved to be of historical interest only and therefore of limited use for the current needs of intelligence analysts. Other than the survey performed by

25X1

- 137 -

only active participation in the project was the preparation of an annotated bibliographic list in cooperation with the China Desk of ORE. 206/ With termination of the project, arrangements were made to maintain contact with the Hoover Library so that FDB would be continually informed of future acquisitions. So far as the six researchers in California were concerned, in the end only one reported for duty in Washington; thus, the valuable experience gained by the participants on the project was lost to FDB. Even the benefit of the additional slots was lost when FDB reverted to the old T/0 of and at the beginning of FY-1950 dropped down to One further gain was achieved in the project's final stage, however. John Bagnall travelled to the West Coast to close out the project and while there took the occasion to survey materials available in certain West Coast universities and also to establish contacts in a number of college faculties with a view to FDB personnel recruitment. 207/ Thus, the Sunshine Project was not a total loss.

Concurrent with the search and survey of domestic sources of foreign-language documents, FDB engaged in similar activity abroad during the postwar period. A number of trips were taken by branch personnel to examine various overseas repositories

225X1

and to provide the means for making significant materials available to Washington.

One of the first of the expeditions was a procurement trip organized and sponsored by the War Department (WD) through its Special Documents Section just prior to the latter's incorporation into DB. On this occasion Henry Jarvinen, then still an Army officer under WD orders, and a Mr. Danciger were sent to Great Britain and Germany on a temporary duty assignment which lasted from 6 February to 30 May 1947. In London they screened, examined, and made available to the War Department a collection of German and Russian documents containing material of value to the study of the USSR's economic potential. This was the Wannsee Collection, so-called because it included documents on the Soviet Union and adjacent countries used by the German Wannsee Institute during the war. It had been evacuated from the St. Lambrecht monastery after the war by the British, but only about a third of the material was held by the British, since the remainder had inadvertantly fallen into the hands of the Russians. Some 400 of the documents were found to be of immediate intelligence value and these were forwarded on loan Jarvinen also used the occasion of the trip to examine the documentary

25**X**1

25X1

- 139 -

resources of the British Air Ministry and of other document collections in the European theater as well as to meet with the document control officers in various army units in Europe. 208/

In 1948 FDB sponsored a second document survey trip in Western Europe. The desire on the part of military authorities in the European theater to arrange for the final disposition of the captured documents problem made it imperative that CIA establish formal liaison with the European Command (EUCOM) in Germany in order to permit an orderly examination of available materials and to arrange for the procurement of documents having intelligence potential. Much of the material was improperly catalogued and therefore considerable quantities of documents of low-grade value were being returned to the United States. Moreover, a considerable part of the existing volume was subject to destruction in the event of an emergency as well as to loss through the return of captured materials to their former owners. For these reasons further delay, it was feared, would result in the permanent loss of many valuable documents. In view of all this, initiated a proposal to send a small survey party to Europe to examine existing US Army repositories, to identify strategic intelligence documents

25X1

#### - 140 -

required in the Zone of Interior (ZI), and to arrange for the acquisition of these documents for the benefit of the intelligence community. It was ascertained that the Navy and Air Force were no longer interested in the documents held in the European theater. However, the State Department and the Army, having expressed considerable interest, signified their willingness to have the FDB screening group represent them in all matters related to the selection and return of documents to the United States. 209/

The upshot was authorization on 28 May 1948 for the selection of a three-man team from FDB to go to Europe for a period of approximately 60 days to conduct the survey. 210/

The persons proposed by FDB and ultimately approved by CIA for this assignment were as head of the group;

25X1

25X1<sub>1</sub>

of the old GMDS; and

formerly of SDS. The composition of the survey group and its mission were also approved by State, the Army, and EUCOM. The survey team left Washington on 12 July and returned to the United States on 19 September. During this period the group travelled almost continuously and consulted as many knowledgeable individuals and custodians of documents and visited as many repositories in Germany as time permitted, some 13 locations in all. Over-

- 141 -

all, the team found about 200 tons of documents of interest to Washington agencies. Of this quantity, over 20 tons were found to be of value to the exploitation operations of FDB. 211/ In general, adequate steps for safe-guarding, destroying, or otherwise accounting for all documentary material were initiated.

On the team's return, prepared and submitted a formal report showing the group's findings and recommendations, including the suggestion that in order to assure an exhaustive monitoring of the disposition of the scattered sources in the European theater trips similar to the one just completed be made at least once every two years. 212/

25X1

No overseas survey trip was taken in 1949, but in the following two years FDD was again involved in procurement abroad — a survey of Near East published materials in 1950 and a survey in the Far East in 1951. Near East publications as a source of intelligence information had been the subject of discussion between the State Department and FDD in September 1950 and it was felt that this region would be a lucrative source. CTA had been receiving some titles through State auspices, but since State had not had one of its publications procurement officers in the area since May 1949, it was felt that many titles were being missed. CTA was therefore anxious to dispatch a competent linguist to the region for a survey trip of approximately two months' duration

- 142 -

to determine the current status of vernacular publications in the area. 213/ The outcome was the assignment of John Bagnall to make the trip to the Near East. Bagnall departed Washington on 25 October 1950 and returned exactly two months later, a period during which he visited 13 cities, mainly capitals, at his destination and en route. The purpose of the stops en route was to locate for FDD unique reference materials on rare languages. 214/

The results of the trip, to judge by the voluminous report submitted by Baqnall upon his return, were worthwhile. emphasized the great need for a regular PPO in the Near East and, in connection with the considerable time-lag (three to four months) in the transmittal of publications to Washington, he recommended assignment of a well-qualified publications analyst to Teheran to monitor the large volume of sources there for information to meet intelligence requirements. 215/ Bagnall followed up the latter proposal in 1951 and recommended, for a 25X1 of FDD's Near six-month's trial period, East/Africa Branch for the assignment. 216/ There is no record 25X1 that this proposal was implemented, although did attend a three-month's training seminar in Beirut, Lebanon, about a year later. 217/

In 1951 FDD dispatched a documents survey team to the Far East, the first to be sent from Washington to this region since the WDC (Adv) group in 1945, before the division even existed. When the WDC (Adv) was dissolved, all initial exploitation, screening, and shipment functions pertaining to Japanese documents became the responsibility of the Document Section, Translator and Interpreter Service (TIS), G-2, General Headquarters (GHQ), Far East Command (FECOM), and remained with this unit from that time on. The work of TIS in the intervening period had come under some criticism. December 1948, George Carey had complained about the paucity of material received by FDB and the generally poor quality of what was received. He deplored in particular the non-receipt of Russian language material formerly held by Japanese research and intelligence agencies which WDC (Adv) records showed existed in Japan. 218/ In answer to Carey's complaint, the Army's Intelligence Division promised to do better and to consolidate its documents collection activity in response to CIA requirements. 219/

The opportunity for a closer relationship with G-2, FECOM, and its source material came in the spring of 1951 when Gen.

Riley F. Ennis replaced Gen. Willoughby in Tokyo as the new G-2.

In the course of an OO briefing before his departure for the			
Far East, Ennis tendered an invitation to send an FDD document			
survey team to and this was promptly accepted. 220/ The	25 <b>X</b> 1		
necessary arrangements were speedily made and	25 <b>X</b> 1		
were designated as the two members of the	25X1		
FDD field survey team. They were assigned to FBIS,	25X1		
for administrative purposes. FBIS further contributed	25 <b>X</b> 1.		
to the mission's success by facilitating direct liaison			
between TIS and FDD through the use of its communication			
facilities. 221/ In a briefing prior to their departure,	•		
were assigned the mission of surveying	25 <b>X</b> 1		
documents captured in World War II and the Korean War, current			
Asiatic Mainland publications (including Russian) received in			
Japan, and Japanese repositories; they were also instructed to			
take measures to solidify the recently established TIS-FDD	,		
liaison. 222/ The two men left Washington on 29 July 1951,			
successfully completed the assigned tasks and	25X1		
returned on 24 September. Among the items of interest in the	:		
report they submitted after their return were the statements			
that FECOM still held approximately 3,000 World War II captured			
documents; that UN forces in Korea had captured to date	•		
approximately 10,000 documents of tactical and 22,500 documents	•		

of strategic value; that the Army and Air intelligence organizations had established their own procurement channels for serial publications of Far Eastern countries and had agreed to share these with FDD; and that all problems arising from the approved TIS-FDD liaison had been discussed and resolved, with TIS agreeing to contribute regularly to FDD's Consolidated Translation Survey (CTS).

25X1

25X1

223/

More document survey missions were in the offing, but the foregoing serve to illustrate the benefits derived by FDD and, in turn, the intelligence community as a result of these undertakings. They were chiefly of value in that they clarified the confused status of document holdings abroad and contributed to a systemized method of liaison between FDD and document repositories abroad, thereby assuring that available data of intelligence value would in the course of time be made known to the community and further assuring that losses of information would be held to a minimum.

## C. <u>Interdepartmental Rivalries</u>

We turn briefly now to a consideration of the day-to-day procurement and flow of the documents which constituted the raw material on which FDD's routine production was based. As

has been mentioned, aside from captured documents which the military provided, the main purveyor of current material at first was the Library of Congress. In the evolution of source procurement the Library's contribution gradually diminished and the major media for acquiring current foreign-language documents from abroad became the State Department, the service attaches, and Allied nations through third countries. There was some direct procurement by FDD, but for the moment this was an exception.

In March 1948, the AD/CD called the DCI's attention to the urgent need for improving exploitation of Russian-language periodicals and cited the cumbersome system whereby the Library of Congress received incoming periodicals from State and, after screening them, sent them on loan to FDB for a two-week period. At the same time he reported that State suggested it be authorized to procure the periodicals for CIA and send them to the Agency directly. 224/ As a result of a subsequent dialogue on this subject between CIA and State, agreement was reached that State would forward to FDB all foreign-language publications received from the USSR, Satellite countries, the Far East, the Near and Middle East, and Scandinavia. The branch was to screen the documents and then

return them to State. 225/ On 4 June 1948, the Agency provided for a working fund to reimburse State for the procurement project and FDB submitted lists of periodicals desired. 226/ In this connection FDB also undertook the briefing of State's PPOs about to leave for foreign assignments and continued this practice from then on. The result was an improvement of the quality of intelligence content of documents received by FDB.

In mid-1948, the intelligence procurement program was expanded beyond the CIA-State agreement. With John Bagnall in attendance, a conference of IAC representatives was held on 2 July at which the first step toward a coordinated IAC program for procurement of foreign publications was taken. By general agreement, the first efforts under the new program were directed to the procurement of Yugoslav documents through State Department sources. The material was to be channeled by State to FDB for centralized processing and the preparation of accessions lists and abstracts. 227/ The program was slow in getting underway and the first shipment of publications was not received until April 1949. 228/ Gradually it increased in regularity and volume and in time was expanded to include all major world areas.

The elimination of the Library of Congress roadblock in the FDB procurement program did much to improve the flow of

the documents from their source to their final destination in the branch; unfortunately, it was only the first of a number of irritating problems to plague this aspect of the branch's operations. Another involved recurrent bickering between FDB and OCD on matters relating to procurement. Jealously guarding its prerogatives as the "library" Office of CIA, OCD adopted a wary stance against any FDB initiatives in document procurement, choosing to regard such activity as an incursion in its allotted domain. OCD took pains on occasion to remind the other Offices of its assigned authority in this field. 229/ However, whether FDB wished to be or not, it was much involved in activities of a library nature, including procurement, and if it occasionally trod on OCD toes, this is not surprising. The rather strained relationship on this score between FDB and OCD in the early period of CIA's existence, when the functions and missions of the Agency's components had not yet been fully defined, was not eased by FDB's contention that the OCD procurement service was unsatisfactory, especially when contrasted to that of the State Department. 230/ Bickering of this sort made it evident that informal coordination of the several Offices' procurement needs was no longer adequate to deal with this and related problems and therefore an attempt

was made to resolve them by creating a CIA Document Procurement Committee. The committee was formed on 17 March 1949 and met regularly thereafter. The CIA Librarian, Joseph Becker of OCD, was to chair the new organization and all CIA Offices were to be represented. John Bagnall was designated to represent FDB, and

One of the committee's function was to coordinate all procurement activities for the various CIA Offices. 231/ Although the Procurement Committee did not resolve all procurement problems to FDB's complete satisfaction, it contributed considerably to alleviating a potentially chaotic situation.

25X1

OCD. Despite the commendation of State's procurement service cited above, a deterioration of sorts set in as regards FDD's relations with IAD, the State Department procurement organization. There were several problems which required solution.

One, which surfaced in early 1950, pertained to a change in IAD's dissemination policy. Over and above certain specific titles paid for and distributed directly to CIA, State obtained many other periodicals for its own use which had in the past also been sent first to FDD. This arrangement was deemed detrimental to State interests and FDD was placed second on

- 150 -

the distribution with the result that issuances of some titles were delayed and in certain instances they were never received at all. The problem was resolved by the allocation of funds sufficient for State to procure the publications in question — some 600 — directly for FDD's benefit. 232/ This improvement was enhanced when the Document Procurement Committee on 27 April 1950 authorized direct publications purchasing by 00 field stations outside Washington. 233/

Another source of contention in IAD-FDD relations arose in 1950 when, due to a misunderstanding in connection with a State allocation in February 1950, IAD announced its intention to divert 55 newspaper and periodical subscriptions needed by FDD for intelligence exploitation to non-IAC agencies — the Library of Congress, the Army Medical Library, and the Department of Agriculture Library — with the provision that these organizations supply copies of the titles to FDD by means of photostats or microfilm. 234/ Bagnall, in a memorandum for George Carey's signature, protested this arrangement and declared IAD's decision to be incompatible with the best interests of national intelligence. He stated further that intelligence needs required that FDD be supplied with the subject titles at the earliest possible date after receipt in

Washington and that the document "trading" suggested by IAD would be detrimental in economy of time and inappropriate from the standpoint of security. 235/ A series of meetings on this matter was held during the spring of 1950 and the solution reached was to permit the IAD arrangement to stand for FY-1950 and to make the necessary readjustments for FY-1951. 236/

During most of its life, and especially in the early period, FDD had to depend upon outside Offices and agencies to conduct its document procurement operations. Though they recognized the central-service function of FDD, these organizations were in the business of procurement for the entire government community, non-intelligence as well as intelligence, and for this reason first priority was not always reserved for FDD. The division, on the other hand, conducted a continuing battle to assert its function of serving all consumers. inevitably led to conflict, as the examples described above well illustrate. Other disputes could be cited. Partly, these conflicting interests were the result of the growing pains of any new operation with the inevitable dislocations attendant thereto; partly, it was a jealous concern by the respective Offices for the requirements of their own functions. Under these circumstances it is not difficult to understand

why a perfect solution was never achieved. In view of the heat generated on occasion, it is indeed surprising that the system worked as well as it did. With the passage of time and with compromise and adjustments on the part of the organizations involved with procurement, circumstances gradually improved.

FDD disenchantment with State procurement policies which placed FDD on a par with the less sensitive non-IAC agencies and also the time-lag in receipt of document sources from State led to a move in 1951 to by-pass this channel in favor of direct procurement overseas by the division. In this connection the proposal was also made to assign several FDD multi-linguists in strategic areas overseas, such as Europe, the Far East, and the Near East, to serve as PPOs for CIA. 237/ As a first step, Carey suggested a trial run on direct procurement from Western Europe, 238/ but this proposal met with a cool reception from both OCD and State. The OCD reply clearly demonstrated the lack of communication between 00 and 0CD. Carey was informed that direct procurement of foreign-language publications had been commenced by CIA Library some two years before because of difficulty with the State channel and now accounted for 18 percent of sources being received from Western Europe. This figure included some 56 percent of the

Western European periodicals needed by FDD. Expansion of this arrangement, he was informed, was anticipated. OCD felt that to let FDD procure its own sources would lead to confusion in covert channels. Moreover, since the CIA Library used the same channels to obtain certain English-language materials, it would be unwise to transfer the procurement operation to FDD. 239/ The effect of this information was to deflate the FDD/OO plan for direct procurement. Carey did not hide his displeasure at being kept in the dark about OCD activities but did agree that OCD direct procurement obviated the need for FDD participation in this activity. 240/ Bagnall concurred in this and also suggested holding in abeyance the plan for placing FDD PPOs overseas until the effectiveness of OCD's procurement activity could be tested. Thereby he hoped to determine which area or areas should be supported by PPOs and which could be effectively covered by OCD without such aid. 241/ This brought to an end for at least the next few years FDD pressure for direct procurement and for overseas representation.

## D. Development of Procurement Procedures

While a modus vivendi relating to document procurement was being slowly hammered out, activity in seeking out and obtaining current overt sources covering intelligence target

areas did not slacken. However, concurrent with the problems discussed above, FDD encountered procurement difficulties from another direction. This related to the direct procurement of sources from the major target areas — the Soviet Union and, subsequently, Communist China. In the spring of 1948 the State Department reported that procurement of Russian newspapers, including the provincial press, was becoming more difficult. Some existing subscriptions had been cancelled by the Soviets, new subscriptions were denied, and multiple copies of periodicals and newspapers were denied or drastically reduced. believed that the Soviets were aware of the use of provincial newspapers for intelligence purposes and that the denials were therefore due to security measures. 242/ In the face of these denials of sources, the possibility of so-called "third-country" procurement - that is, the obtaining of the desired Sovietpublished sources from countries outside the Soviet Union, in particular the Satellite and Scandinavian areas contiguous to it, was given serious consideration. Beginning in August 1948, FDB, in cooperation with OCD and the State Department conducted an informal survey of US and "third country" sources from which Soviet documents could be obtained. The search involved contacts with numerous private individuals and enterprises, libraries

and schools, government agencies, and foreign embassies of the

Free World. The response was very favorable. In the course

of the survey the branch suggested that arrangements might be

made with the governments of countries benefitting under the

American Aid program to have access to all publications procured

in the USSR by such countries. Such an arrangement with the

Chinese Nationalists, who had diplomatic representatives in

11 cities in the USSR (whereas the United States had representatives

in only two Soviet cities), would be particularly fruitful,

especially in regard to the Soviet Far East, where material

was very scanty and hard to obtain.

who conducted

25X1

the overall survey for FDB, suggested approaching State on this

matter. 243/

25X1

25X1

In September, the State Department approved George Carey's

19 August 00 memorandum conveying recommendation and

immediately instructed its representatives in Moscow and Nanking

to initiate informal contact with the Chinese Nationalists

relative to Soviet sources. Similar arrangements were made for

the procurement of Chinese Communist material. 244/ In early

January 1949, on the basis of a memorandum from Carey

reported that annual subscriptions for Soviet periodicals had

been placed by the Chinese Nationalist representatives but

- 156 -

warned that the availability of these sources depended upon the ability of the Nationalist Government to maintain the status quo in China. In view of the Communist threat to the latter, he strongly recommended that immediate efforts be made to stockpile all other provincial publications available to the Chinese Nationalist consular offices. 245/

The success of the new arrangements was almost immediately apparent. In February 1949, the first two air shipments of USSR provincial press publications were received by FDB and in the succeeding months many more shipments of this material arrived. These shipments represented one of the high points in the FDB-State Department Coordinated Procurement Program. 246/This cooperative arrangement was designated the "Sochi" Program.

The return to China of the Chinese ambassador to the USSR in May 1949 caused some concern in FDB about the continued receipt of vital press material from the USSR, but the shipment of these sources to Washington continued into late 1949. In response to FDB's query, State assured the branch that attempts to increase the stockpiling of all categories of publications from the USSR would continue; however, the security of the "Sochi" project was of primary concern. 247/ With the take-over of the Chinese mainland by the Communists in October 1949 the

"Sochi" project came to an end and all activity in connection with it was terminated. The success of the project is evident from the fact that during the ten months prior to its termination, FDD received more than 1,100 Soviet provincial newspapers from points east of the Urals, sources which would otherwise have been unobtainable. 248/

When the procurement of hard-to-get Soviet sources through the medium of Chinese Nationalist consular posts became a dead issue, emphasis on Far Eastern sources was greatly increased. Some effort was directed to the procurement of non-Chinese sources; for example, special arrangements were made in November 1949 to initiate the flow of underground publications from French Indochina and the procurement, through the Army, of North Korean sources. 249/ However, with the advent of Communist power in China, greatest emphasis was put on this area. Special steps were planned to revitalize the procurement of current Chinese publications, which recent events in China had seriously impaired. In view of the increasing importance of the more than nine million overseas Chinese, a survey of publications issued by and for them was made at the end of 1949 with particular emphasis on Chinese publications issued in Central and South America. 250/ Then, in January 1950, the British indicated a

willingness to have their facilities on the Chinese mainland and in Hong Kong used for procurement of Chinese Communist publications. 251/ At FDD's request a procurement program was started and in May 1,200 Chinese Communist newspapers from 15 Chinese cities were received in the division, 252/ a number increased to 18 cities by September. 253/ Coverage was eventually curtailed when the number of British stations in China was reduced from nine to three, but these continued to supply Chinese acquisitions on a limited scale. 254/

25X1

25X1

On 18 January 1951, proposed a revival in somewhat altered form of the "Sochi" project employed in 1948 and 1949, this time directed against the Chinese Communists instead of the Soviets. believed that in exchange for US aid to the Chinese Nationalists, arrangements could be effected with Nationalist officials to permit American access to overt and captured Communist materials. This operation would in effect constitute the use by the United States of the widespread Chinese Nationalist intelligence network in China and Southeast Asia. 255/ The proposal was considered by OO and in April Col. Lawrence K. White, Acting AD/O, posed the feasibility of the undertaking to the Office of Special Operations. 256/ The response was favorable and OSO agreed

- 159 -

to take on responsibility for procurement of Chinese Communist sources for FDD, by regular overt subscription in Hong Kong while circumstances still permitted or by clandestine means when and if conditions changed for the worse, as then seemed imminent. 257/ Like "Sochi," the new project, designated "Earwig," also proved successful though to a more limited degree. The first shipment of Chinese Communist publications under "Earwig" arrived in March 1952 and thereafter shipments were received on a fairly regular basis. OSO subsequently served under other programs as procurer by clandestine means of sources from many parts of the world outside the Far East. 258/

In 1952, a further development in the procurement effort occurred when, in evaluating recent surveys and estimates, ORR and the Office of National Estimates (ONE) called attention to the extent of the Agency's ignorance with respect to Communist China, particularly in the economic field. This concern was reviewed with other members of the IAC and resulted in the issuance of a paper by ONE on 25 July 1952 entitled, "Statement of Intelligence Deficiencies Revealed in SE-27." It pointed out the need for coordinating, translating, indexing, and distributing the material already available in the intelligence community on Communist China. 259/ FDD, together with OCD and

IAD/State, became closely involved in the resulting project. Although in its eventual evolution the SE-27 Project resulted in the handling of increased translation and exploitation requirements and in the indexing of new sources, its more immediate effect on the division related to the survey/ procurement effort involved. Thus, on 8 September agreement was reached that FDD, in cooperation with OCD, would investigate and identify all overt and covert Chinese literature in the United States dealing with Communist China. 260/ On 29 January 1953, George Carey reported to the Assistant Director of Intelligence Coordination (AD/IC), who was in charge of coordinating activities pertaining to the SE-27 Project, that beginning on 1 February and for a period not in excess of five months, FDD would prepare annotated bibliographies of Chinese Communist material on Chinese economics and science. Operations were to begin with the facilities at Harvard University and would proceed to other institutions until full coverage had been achieved. 261/

As we have seen, FDD had already for some time engaged in the collection and survey of Chinese source materials.

Prior to Carey's announcement, FDD had, via IAD/State, initiated the "Third Country" Program for procuring Chinese

documents. In addition, in December 1952 FDD had completed a survey of Chinese-language holdings at the Library of Congress, the Harvard-Yenching Institute in Cambridge, the University of Chicago, and at various West Coast institutions, including the Hoover Institute. Among other procurement arrangements, FDD had established through OO's Contact Division a system to receive all current serials from various repositories throughout the country. 262/

25X1

25X1

25X1

In January 1953 Chief of the Far East Branch of FDD, went to Harvard University to set up procedures for preparing annotated bibliographies of the holdings there and to arrange for the regular receipt of the university's new acquisitions for the preparation of supplementary bibliographies on a continuous basis. 263/ 'In February, also of the Far East Branch, reported to Harvard to begin the preparation of the bibliographies, a task which he completed in April. 264/ Meanwhile, proceeded on a tour of 32 American libraries, colleges, and universities to survey the Chinese Communist publications at these places. On his return in April he reported finding only two institutions with any significant collections of such publications, namely, the Hoover Institute and the library of the University of Southern California. 265/

In the course of his trip located a total of 1,230 documents on the target subject. Combining this number with the holdings in FDD, he was able to report 1,759 documents as answering the SE-27 Project requirement. Of the total, 1,064 were non-duplicated items. 266/

25X1

By 1953 the methodology of routine procurement employed by FDD through its contacts with OCD, State, the military services, and others was firmly established, and, to the extent that the division could control it, the flow of raw source was reasonably smooth. Little could be done about out-of-the-ordinary developments, such as the curtailment and denial of Soviet and Chinese Communist sources, but the division had learned to adapt to such crises. Special procurement assignments like the SE-27 Project just described could also be taken on and were dealt with as they occurred, usually, as experience increased, in an efficient and thorough manner. The result of the procurement operation was an increasing volume of raw source material,\* the growth of which created a new problem: how to synthesize and reduce this mass to a manageable and meaningful product. This is the subject of the next chapter.

- 163 -

<sup>\*</sup> During a 12-month period in 1951 and 1952 some 248,144 foreign-language documents were received by FDD. 267/

CHAPTER SIX

#### The Products

### A. Phase-Out of Captured Document Processing

Almost from the beginning of the postwar phase of document exploitation, the end of captured documents as source material was anticipated and plans were made to abandon them in favor of current sources. The change-over was made and organization and operations geared to it, but the transition was not abrupt. While processing of current sources was increasingly emphasized, from 1946 to 1950 captured documents were systematically exploited by FDD and its predecessor organizations for information on the USSR and Eastern Europe. This operation yielded important data of considerable benefit to the intelligence community; the information was mainly, however, of a basic nature. Over 40,000 cards from German and about 52,500 cards from Japanese sources, incorporated in the SDS-initiated Industrial Card File, were produced during this period, turned over to OCD, and included in the CIA Industrial Register (IR). Also produced were 88 studies in depth on various Soviet industrial and economic

subjects, 42 studies on a Soviet railroad project drawn from German sources, and 195 accession lists and some 750 miscellaneous economic reports from captured Japanese documents. 268/

When the research and exploitation functions of GMDS were transferred to CIA in June 1947, custody of captured German and Italian\* documents was assumed by the Adjutant General, War Department. Accordingly, FDB maintained a screening team physically located in the Pentagon. The team rapidly scrutinized the large volume of documents continually being received and prepared abstracts of the small percentage of documents possessing intelligence value. The abstracts were reproduced in card form and disseminated to interested agencies. The second step in this procedure was the exploitation of these documents to meet intelligence needs. This was done on the basis of requirements submitted by recipients of the abstract cards and also in accordance with special continuing projects established in the branch to obtain certain types of needed information. Exploitation necessitated the borrowing by FDB of original documents from

<sup>\*</sup> The number of captured Italian documents held by GMDS was small, only about 4,000. 269/

the GMDS unit in the Pentagon. Following their processing, they were returned to the Pentagon shelves. Processing of captured Japanese documents was similar, with the exception that this material was in the custody of FDB rather than the War Department and therefore did not have to be borrowed.

Moreover, abstracts of Japanese documents were distributed in the form of accession lists rather than cards. 270/ The lists were issued at irregular intervals under 11 general subject headings — geographic, political, technical, etc. 271/

FDB's work on captured documents moved along at such a pace that the backlog of Japanese materials, numbering 756,000 items as of 1 December 1946 when CIG took over the branch, and of German documents, amounting to 50,630 on 1 September 1947 following FDB's incorporation of SDS and GMDS, was estimated to have been reduced to 26,500 and 22,000 items, respectively, by 1 September 1948. Meanwhile, approximately 1,000 to 2,000 captured documents per month for each national category were being currently received. 272/

In addition to routine document handling, FDB from time to time also engaged in the screening and, when warranted, exploitation of special document collections captured during the war. These collections, some of which were very extensive, varied widely in the amount of intelligence information

they contributed. The so-called Rosenberg Collection, established by the Nazi ideologue of that name before and during World War II to assist in the study of theories and practices inimical to Naziism, was said to contain a large quantity of documents of sociological, political, and psychological warfare value and was highly recommended to the DCI by George F. Kennan, then on the staff of the National War College. 273/FDB scanning of the Rosenberg materials in late 1947 and early 1948 revealed nothing of intelligence value, however. 274/

Other collections of this nature screened by FDB included the following: the Tambach Collection of German documents, dealing mainly with naval information, which was processed in 1948; 275/ the Berlin-Dahlem Library, a collection of 50,000 items primarily of reference value on Eastern Europe, and the Sven Hedin Institute Library, another reference facility, both screened in the fall of 1949; 276/ the Vladimir Bruza Documents, a collection containing valuable information on Czech industry, which was located by FDD late in 1949; 277/ and the Anders Collection at the Hoover Library in California. The latter collection, consisting of some 62,000 pages of Polishlanguage interrogation reports and statements gathered during 1939-1942 by the Second Polish Corps under Gen. Anders and

describing personal experiences and observations on the Soviet occupation of Poland, was highly regarded by the intelligence community. 278/ Originally destined for full FDD exploitation, the Anders project was downgraded and the division's role was eventually limited to a preliminary investigation in 1950. In early 1951, financial and operational responsibility for the project was finally turned over to the Air Force, which appeared to have primary interest in it. 279/

With the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950, FDD once again became engaged in captured documents exploitation, and arrangements were made for the division to examine captured enemy documents returned to the Zone of Interior by FECOM. 280/ As a result, numerous shipments of captured war documents were received by FDD for exploitation. 281/ There was a difference, however, between this and the older World War II material in the factor of currency. The documents captured in the Korean War and forwarded to FDD were integrated into the division's regular exploitation program. Beyond the continuing effort to beef up the FDD cadre to contend with the increased workload, no special adjustments were made to cope with this category of sources.

By 1950, war document exploitation had reached a point of diminishing returns from the standpoint of intelligence yield.

Brief revivals of captured document research occurred, such as the Korean War operation noted above, but these occasions represented minor deviations from the routine. They will be treated, as applicable, later on.

Despite the voluminous output from captured documents in the immediate postwar years, this activity was primarily a phase-out operation. As such it generated several problems quite apart from those connected with exploitation of the diminishing volume of captured documents. One such problem concerned the disposition of the documents after their use by FDB for intelligence purposes, that is, the question of which documents to retain and store in permanent depositories, which to return to their former owners, and which to destroy. Many non-IAC agencies and non-governmental institutions, knowing of the acquisitions by occupying forces in Germany and Japan, sought to obtain a share in the documents. Related to this was the question of ownership which came up briefly after the war. Agreements with the Allied forces, which had cooperated in the collection effort, had to be reconciled with the US requirements. In early 1947, the British broached the matter of document ownership and custody of Japanese documents and approached the DCI concerning the question. Since the armed

services had had original custody of the documents before transferring them to CIG in 1946, Hillenkoetter directed the question to the War Department. He was informed that Intelligence Division files contained nothing to deny sole US title to the documents in WDC. An informal working agreement with the British on joint participation in exploitation activities existed, but there was no record of binding agreements requiring British or other foreign concurrence prior to public release of materials. 282/ The British argued that Japanese documents were jointly owned because of their capture by Gen. MacArthur as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, 283/ but this reasoning was not accepted by the United States. On the basis of a 1945 British-American agreement on captured documents, the British contended strongly that unless and until a peace treaty determined otherwise, the German documents, whatever their physical location, belonged to the combined governments. 284/ From a practical standpoint, the question of custody insofar as it related to the British had little effect on FDB operations nor did it adversely color FDB's relations with its British counterpart in the postwar period. The relationship remained one of cordiality throughout.

The problem of disposal of exploited captured materials was considered early and decisions were made on what to do with the documents. As mentioned in a previous chapter,\* in keeping with the recommendations of the Japanese Document Conference held in January 1945, all non-military documents having no intelligence value were divided into two parts. Those of cultural or historic interest were sent to the Library of Congress and the remainder, at a later date, to the National Archives. Documents of intelligence value were retained and exploited in FDB and subsequently retired to the National Archives, destroyed, or returned to the Japanese and Germans. The branch's legal authority in document disposal was based on a statement by the General Counsel, in answer to a query from the AD/CD on 19 August 1947, that initial responsibility for declaring that intelligence exploitation of these documents was completed and that they were subject to final disposal rested with the Documents Branch. 285/

The branch was able to perform a beneficial service to private United States industry by making available for public use a good part of its captured document holdings. This was done in

<sup>\*</sup> See Ch. One.

conjunction with a 1945 executive order\* which declared it to be US government policy, subject to the requirements of national security, to make available to the public free and general dissemination of enemy scientific and industrial information. accordance with this order, DB, in January 1947, released to the Commerce Department's Office of Technical Services (OTS) between 1,300 and 1,400 captured Japanese scientific and industrial periodicals. Duplicate copies of these documents were retained by DB. German documents of this category were also released to OTS, which planned to prepare abstracts based on the contents of the periodicals and to publish them in accession lists subscribed to by American industrial firms. All of the documents held by DB were classified, but since the periodicals concerned had originally been publicly issued in Japan there appeared to be no difficulty in declassifying The problem of securing authority to do this was left in the hands of the Department of Commerce. At the same time, DB also made available to OTS all Japanese patents held by the branch which were not primarily designed for military application, so that these could also be released to the public. 286/ This step represented the first instance of the

<sup>\*</sup> Executive Order No. 9604, 27 August 1945

branch's contribution to the American public through OTS. In future years, with establishment of the organization's field units, this function would be considerably expanded and based on current sources rather than on captured documentary materials. This development will be more fully treated in a later chapter.

The disposal of FDB's holdings of captured enemy documents continued apace, and in 1948 reported the completion, on 1 April, of the cataloguing and transfer to the National Archives of 1,478,611 captured Japanese documents. 287/ Immediately thereafter, the FDB library was screened to eliminate material of no intelligence interest. As a result, by 1 September, 157,685 captured documents had been forwarded to the Library of Congress. 288/ This process of transfer to other depositories continued at a decreasing pace in the succeeding months as the volume of documents diminished, until, by the end of 1948, captured documents represented only a minor part of FDB holdings. 289/ By mid-1949, the majority of captured documents had been processed and the emphasis from then on was almost entirely on current publications. On 9 January 1950, legal title to all captured Japanese documents which had been sent to the Library of Congress was transferred by CIA to the Library. 290/ By March 1951, the number of captured documents remaining in FDD's

25**X**1

possession amounted to about 40,000 items. 291/ These were documents of basic intelligence interest and were to be retained on a permanent basis.

The diminution of captured document holdings in FDD did not bring to a complete end the exploitation of this type of source material. Even as late as 1957 sporadic efforts were made to glean the last bit of potential intelligence data from these sources. This was not through FDD initiative since the division, from its experience with captured documents, was aware of the small likelihood of finding more material in them. Usually the impetus for a new "go" at the documents came from other parts of CTA. It proved difficult to convince many of the Agency analysts that the lode had been thoroughly mined. However, when projects for new searches were suggested, the division, depending upon the legitimacy of the request, would with reluctance offer its services, since the exploitation function was by authority assigned to it and the division was the unit best equipped to carry it out.

Among such instances was a joint ORR/FDD program conducted to exploit available intelligence by extracting statistical tables from Japanese-language documents held in FDD. The project, conducted during the period May-October 1953 by two FDD intelligence officers, resulted in the preparation of 4,488 tables. 292/

Concurrent with this project was one initiated by an ORR-	
sponsored exploitation committee headed by Acti-	25X1
vated in January 1953, this group prepared plans for a thorough	
exploitation of the German military documents stored after the	
war in the Federal Records Center at Alexandria, Virginia, under	,
control of the Adjutant General's Office. 293/ A series of mis-	
understandings and lack of coordination led to some friction	-
with FDD. John Bagnall reminded that the ORR project	25X1
was properly an 00 function. He further called attention to	
the earlier FDD exploitation of these same sources during the	
period 1947-1949. Despite this, Bagnall reluctantly agreed to	
support the project. 294/ An FDD officer, was	25 <b>X</b> 1
assigned to the project to assist ORR analysts in screening the	
GMDS collection and this activity was carried out in 1953 and	
1954.	
A related undertaking and one also concerned with the	•

captured German documents at Alexandria was a psychological—
warfare project initiated in 1951 as the War Documentation Project (WDP) under the code name

This undertaking was
designed to support the planning and conduct of operations against
the Soviet Union and international Communism. Its importance lay
in the fact that the captured German documents comprised the most
complete available record of the only period in recent history

25X1

- 175 -

# **SECRET**

when a large segment of Soviet territory was open for study and operation. The project envisaged the preparation of three reports, viz: "Political and Police Controls in the Red Army During World War II, " "The Peasantry as a Source of Soviet Vulnerability," and "Soviet Agent Operations in the German-Occupied Territories During World War II." It was initially established under an Air Force contract with Columbia University with Philip Mosely of Columbia as the senior consultant. After production of the three reports by the Columbia staff, the project was terminated in May 1955, but prior to that, CIA was approached about continuing the work. The Requirements Staff/Office of Intelligence Support (ROM/ OIS) canvassed the CIA offices and found that one of the major requirements would be for the preparation of histories of Soviet military units and, in this connection, a compilation of related German documents. 295/ It was proposed that FDD handle all DD/P requirements related to the project, and this the division agreed to do. The appropriated cost was only \$8,500 for overtime, for which funds were to be provided by DD/P. Scheduled to cover 13 man-months of work, the overtime was to supplement 20 man-months of regular time spent on the project. This initial estimate contrasted favorably to the nearly \$100,000 spent for external research at Columbia University. Eight FDD German document experts were assigned at various times to the WDP project and work

commenced on 1 July 1955. 296/ The early estimate for the project's duration proved overly optimistic and work continued until May 1957. It was, however, finally brought to a successful conclusion and FDD's contribution earned high praise from RQM/OIS. At the latter's request, citing the further need for WDP material, FDD budgeted funds for continuation of research on the German documents, at least through the next fiscal year. This was to be contingent, however, on maintenance of the levels of FDD funding and personnel then in effect. 297/

During the 1950s, additional exploitation of Japanese and German documents was conducted by the division, but diminishing returns finally brought this aspect of document exploitation to an end. The product of the captured document research had provided valuable information for the Agency's analysts; however, the processing of current sources held a higher priority, and the greatest part of FDD operations, even during this period, was devoted to current exploitation.

# B. Transition to Processing of Current Materials

The phase-out of captured document exploitation and transition to processing of current materials necessitated an increased alertness on FDB's part to the requirements of the consumer Offices in the Agency. The target areas after the war had shifted away from the erstwhile enemies, Germany and Japan, at first primarily to the Soviet Union and its Satellites and subsequently to Communist China. Throughout the Agency the emphasis changed

gradually from basic research to current reporting, and this shift, as we have seen, was reflected also in FDB's services to the community. It required a change from methodical extraction of data from old, sometimes out-dated documents to rapid reporting based on current publications such as newspapers and This change did not come about all at once; indeed, the transition was at times exceedingly slow and, when accomplished, was not always successful. But the commitment was made, and the branch strove to implement it as rapidly and effectively as possible. Because FDB as an organization and the concept of centralized exploitation were both new, the procedures employed to develop a program were often hit-or-miss -- sometimes successful, sometimes not. The branch was not adverse to adjusting to valid criticism and suggestion from the outside and, when this was missing, to engaging in introspection to develop improved methods on its own. The final result, an integrated and expanded reporting program based on a language capability that increased over the years from some 30 to about 90 languages, was, by and large, successful and served capably in the long run to the satisfaction of most of it consumers.

As has been pointed out, the program FDB inherited in mid-1947 from its predecessors was, with the exception of a

small current press exploitation operation by the old SDS, basically oriented to war documents. "Current," in connection with a few press receipts from the British, was a deceptive term because the newspapers processed were already relatively old when received by the branch. Moreover, only the economic portion was extracted from the newspapers since political items were translated by the Joint Press Reading Service at the US Embassy in Moscow. Small though it was, this operation represented the first press exploitation engaged in by the new organization.

Another inherited operation, the publication of accession lists of Far Eastern documents, was re-examined in the light of an earlier TCAPS survey of DB operations to determine the need for its continuance. It was decided that, due to lack of interest in the lists on the part of FDB consumers, only those having a "special or current interest" would be continued.

Authorization to effect this change was granted on 9 September 1947. 298/

On the basis of the same ICAPS survey, the AD/O was instructed on 30 July 1947 to arrange for publication by machine records of bibliographies of source materials and at the same time to establish a program for exploitation of foreign-language documents by Documents Branch in response to detailed requirements and priorities to be formulated by OCD. 299/ This directive is of interest in that it represented the first move in the direction of an organized program of formal levying of requirements on the branch. In August, Gen. Sibert reported that FDB would compile all relevant bibliographic data on current documents of intelligence value but not by machine records since this was a function of Reference Center, ORE, and not of OO. At the same time he indicated that an exploitation program coordinated with definite requirements and established priorities was being prepared by OO in cooperation with OCD. 300/ The formulation of such a program was another first for the branch.

Action on bibliographic operations by FDB was not long in coming. At a meeting of the Projects Review Committee on 10 December 1947, attended by Bagnall, and other 00 people, Project 00-20 was approved providing for a complete bibliography of current Soviet periodicals to be undertaken by 00 upon receipt of a statement of requirements from ORE. The initial proposal provided for the Library of Congress to conduct the operation, but when the choice of supporting an outside activity or utilizing CIA funds to improve internal efficiency was considered, the latter course seemed preferable and the project was assigned to FDB. As presented to the committee, the

-25X1

project had been limited solely to scientific and technical periodicals, which were regarded as having greater intelligence value, but after some discussion it was decided to include all Soviet journals. 301/ On being questioned concerning FDB's capability to perform the work, Sibert replied that insofar as factors such as workload, availability of personnel, and the priority situation were predicable, FDB could undertake the additional responsibility on a continuing basis. 302/ meeting attended by and Bagnall on 17 February, agreement was reached that FDB would receive direct from the State Department all incoming Russian-language periodicals of potential intelligence value and the Library of Congress would continue to receive from State cultural journals and the like. further decided that FDB would conform to a pattern of priorities in the following order: Complete bibliographic service (translation of all tables of contents), abstracts, and translations. 303/ The project, involving preparation of the new FDB weekly publication Bibliography of Russian Periodicals, was initiated on 25 March 1948, 304/ and by April the first bibliographies were ready for distribution. 305/ The first issue of the new series was disseminated on 12 May and publication of the bibliographies continued until 29 March 1949. By that time a total of 656 had been published. 306/

25X1

In April 1948, arrangements were made with the Library of Congress to disseminate the FDB bibliographies to recipients elsewhere in the government and also to private individuals, with references to their CIA genesis omitted. At the same time, the Library agreed to perform a similar bibliographic service on current USSR cultural publications and to complement this coverage by performing the same service on all Soviet books and monographs available to it. The medium of dissemination was to be a new Library of Congress publication entitled Monthly List of Russian Accessions (MLRA). 307/ By the following spring, it had become evident that the bibliographic operation was proving more time-consuming than FDB had anticipated and was creating delays in the production of classified material. Library, which had been distributing FDB's Bibliography as a supplement to its MLRA, indicated its willingness to assume responsibility for reproducing this information for general distribution after translation by FDB. Its intention was to incorporate the material in the MLRA. The advantages of this arrangement were readily apparent and Carey requested immediate approval. 308/ This was granted on 5 April 309/ and the effective date of the transfer was set as 20 April 1949. 310/ The shift of the publications part of the operation to the Library of Congress resulted in a considerable saving of time and helped ease somewhat the press of work on the short-handed FDB clerical staff. The use made of the *Bibliography of Russian Periodicals* was broad. It received a wide distribution, both inside and outside the government, and the secret of its origin as a CIA product was a poorly kept one. Presumably it was useful to many of its recipients, but as to its value to ORE, the original requestor, and other purely intelligence users, AD/O was of the opinion that it was slight. 311/

Concurrent with the branch activity just described, FDB in early 1947 began a phase of development which was to establish the pattern for its major form of activity from then on.

On 2 April 1947, a new report entitled FDB Periodical Abstracts came into existence on the basis of the authorization granted the branch to exploit current foreign-language periodicals.

Then, as a result of the exchange

which called for FDB processing of Soviet provincial newspapers, a second report, designated Soviet Press Extracts, was issued for the first time on 26 January 1948. The initiation of these two reports may be said to mark the official beginning of FDD press and periodical exploitation.

The FDB Periodical Abstracts, in its original format, was issued only five times and then discontinued on 23 June 1947.

25X1

The following month, the report was reconstituted as a two-part publication, that is "Scientific" and "General" abstracts. The "Scientific" abstracts series was issued for the first time on 6 August 1947 and, with the exception of a brief hiatus in 1951 when OSI unsuccessfully attempted over the opposition of the other IAC members to reinstate the earlier *Bibliography* operation in place of the abstracts, continued until May 1954. Publication of the "General" series started on 12 September, but the report survived for only a little over a year. In the fall of 1948,

declared this method of periodical exploitation to

25**X**1

be unsatisfactory and submitted a plan for discontinuance of the Periodical Abstracts - General — the "Scientific" series would be retained — and its replacement by a new series of information reports. The latter differed from the old abstracts, which had featured summaries of journal articles, in that they were to include only the intelligence information extracted from each article and to exclude the verbose padding characteristic of Soviet literature. The extracted items would, moreover, be grouped or collated on one subject or area and thus permit direct routing to interested parties.

Initiative was doubtless based on the precedent set by the branch in using this method in its press exploitation. The advantages foreseen from extracting

25X1

#### - 184 -

# SECRET

rather than abstracting were quite definite in terms of lower costs and better service. 312/ On 9 November the "General" abstracts were discontinued and information reports were subsequently substituted for them. 313/

While the effort to improve reporting methods was going on, the exploitation of the press

FDB continued and issues of the Soviet Press Extracts were disseminated sporadically as these shipments were received.

Exploitation was primarily confined to the extraction of all industrial information.

25X1

25X1

Meanwhile, the search for other sources of the Soviet press was underway and in April 1948 a survey undertaken by OCD and FDB revealed that copies of approximately 45 Soviet newspaper titles of interest were being received by various agencies in Washington. Arrangements were therefore made with the Departments of State, Army, and Navy to obtain these sources for exploitation purposes. 314/ One by-product of the search for new sources was the receipt from the Army of a number of Yugoslav publications sent from Belgrade by the US military attache. To handle these, plans were underway to develop translation facilities in FDB to exploit Serbo-Croation material and it was anticipated that qualified linguists would be obtained

in the next several months. FDB therefore requested continued receipt of this material until arrangements could be made with State to obtain the publications on a regular basis through its facilities. 315/ Plans were also formulated for procurement of other Satellite sources through embassy channels. 316/ The result was an expanded output of intelligence. This was further broadened when, in May 1948, FDB was authorized to move into the field of Chinese press exploitation, 317/ a development which resulted in the first issuance of a Chinese Press Extracts report on 30 July. At about the same time, on 28 July, the branch published its first Finnish Press Extracts. Publication of Korean, Indochinese, and Indonesian press reports followed soon after. 318/

This expansion continued for several years. In 1952, among the lesser languages, for example, coverage of the Bengali and Urdu press and the Afrikaans press was initiated. A Diaspora Unit was established to expand coverage of the Jewish world, and reports were prepared for the first time from information based on Uzbek, Turkestan, Tatar, and Azerbaijani documents. At the same time, coverage of Western Europe was enlarged with exploitation of an increased number of newspapers and periodicals received from that area. 319/ Expansion by FDB into other linguistic

areas of the world, some as remote as Tibet, was effected as personnel with the pertinent language capabilities were recruited, until eventually full coverage of strategic world areas was achieved. The striking expansion in press exploitation in FDB is underlined by the fact that from a total of 4,470 issues of newspapers and periodicals handled in 1947, already by 1948 the number of newspapers alone had risen to 56,630, while 6,616 journal copies were also processed. 320/

With the flood gates open, so to speak, the branch was well on its way to complete foreign-language overt coverage, the only drawback being the shortage of linguistic officers with the required competence to handle all the new sources. Recruitment efforts to fill the void continued unabated and the number of languages handled by FDB gradually increased, so that from 36 in 1948, 321/ by 1950 the branch had attained a capability of 54 languages and dialects, 322/ by 1951, 67, 323/ and by 1952, 93. 324/ Since FDB had expanded considerably beyond Russian- and Satellite-language exploitation, in September 1948 the press extract report was redesignated the Foreign Press Extracts. Augmentation of its language capabilities permitted the branch gradually to expand its operations to cover the major target areas of the world. At the end of 1948, these included

the Soviet Union, Eastern and Western Europe, North Africa, the Middle East, the Far East, and South America. 325/

The expansion of source procurement and of the area of coverage in FDD was accompanied in the next few years by efforts toward refining the techniques for reporting the intelligence collected and continued attempts to improve their application. The effort did not always succeed but this was not from lack of trying. Among changes in the division was the gradual reshaping of its reporting program to conform to the needs of the community. With the shift to greater emphasis on press exploitation, the program, which had consisted of abstracts, extracts, complete translations, bibliographies, and accession lists, was altered. The bibliographies and accession lists were dropped early; the translation function was retained and expanded, particularly from 1951 on; abstracting was reduced in scope and limited to scientific and technical sources; and extracting took the form of the compilation or collation of information. The latter change was designed to employ the limited cadre of the division and its work qualifications to best advantage and to serve the consumer Offices in the most efficient manner. The changes in reporting techniques resulted in the development of a series of special report categories which reflected both the characteristics of FDD's source material and consumer requirements on the one hand and the division's accumulated experience on how best to serve as a "common concern" facility on the other.

The report categories included in the FDD program in 1951 were as follows:

25X1

25X1

FDD Summary — Essentially similar to the report but exceeding 15 pages in length and more elaborate, with tables and illustrations as required.

Q Information Report — A translation of an unpublished foreign-language document or material from covert sources in response to a specific request, but containing information of general interest.

FDD Translation — The same in content as a Q Report but including reportage in excess of 15 pages or embodying tabular or illustrative material.

U Report — An unpublished translation prepared in a single-copy typewritten draft in response to a specific request of interest only to the requester.

FDD Periodical Abstracts — Brief translated items abstracted from foreign scientific and technical journals (issued in card form after 1954).

FDD Reference Aids — Collections in terms, lists, tables, and the like extracted and collated in the course of routine translation and exploitation in the Division.

In general, the format developed by FDD was well received by consumers and, with modifications, remained essentially in the 1951 form for the life of the division.

- 189 -

### **SECRET**

The development of the FDD report program was, unfortunately, not without its problems. Although the consumer Offices were in general favorably inclined toward the exploitation method employed by FDD, considerable dissatisfaction was expressed over the interminable delays experienced between the publication date of the basic source and the date of the exploited information's dissemination by FDD. For example, at the start of the press exploitation operation, the first report issued in January 1948 contained items from issues dated September 1947, a delay of more than four months. 326/ These were newspapers, and as procurement shifted to State Department facilities, the situation improved, but never to the full satisfaction of the consumers. This type of criticism was endemic in the division's relations with its consumers in the early period and put it constantly on the defensive, with the result that FDD officers spent considerable time explaining to consumers the reasons for delay. While the delays were partly the inevitable result of hitches occurring in the organization's "shakedown" period, much of the problem was beyond FDD's power to rectify. In complaining in October 1947 that the Periodical Abstracts had not been on a "current" basis since its inception in mid-July, John Bagnall cited a number of reasons for this, including the higher priority

25X1

accorded captured document processing and ICF production, reproduction difficulties outside FDB, and the critical personnel situation. Various solutions were suggested 327/ and some were applied. These and other problems persisted, however, and much time was spent attempting to find solutions.

The procurement problem was partially alleviated when the receipt of the foreign press was arranged through State Department facilities, and the use of air transport, first for the press and subsequently for periodicals, also helped a great deal. Other operational improvements of various kinds aided in providing quicker service. At the request of certain FDD consumers, particularly ORE, a study was undertaken to correct delays. The outcome took shape in what the division termed its "high speed press" procedure, designed to process, exploit, and publish press material within 48 hours after receipt of the source in FDD. 328/ This method, adopted in October 1949, aided considerably in improving FDD operations and had the effect of dampening much of the criticism.

Other efforts to solve the time-lag problem were made. For example, arrangements for short-cuts in dissemination were worked out by FDD to provide other Offices with more rapid receipt of overt OCD 329/ and covert OSO materials, 330/ and the editing of unclassified translation was dispensed with to speed up delivery

to requesters. 331/ Other devices were employed, the purpose in each case being to provide better service to consumer organizations. In the long run the operational capabilities of the division improved to a point where criticisms of its methods and their results were reduced to a tolerable level.

Much of the division's progress in improving production occurred under the aegis of the Ad Hoc Committee on Exploitation of Foreign Documents, during its brief existence in 1949 and subsequently under its successor committees. The primary accomplishment of these IAC committees was to define more closely the FDD mission and to guide the division's operations so as to permit it to serve the community in the best and most efficient manner possible. The early ad hoc committees in effect directed FDD to perform the "common service" function which was eventually formalized in May 1953.

In addition to exploiting current publications, the division continued to service the community's translation requests. As foreign—language document receipts increased and the volume of unprocessed material grew in CIA Office files, it became obvious that extraordinary effort was necessary to deal with this material. FDD surveyed Offices having need of translation service and presented its findings to the Projects Review Committee. As a result, funds for contracting translation of unclassified material and

creating additional positions in FDD for classified translation were approved in January 1951. The effect of this step was soon evident. By June 1951, translation service to CIA was 100 percent above the amount provided six months earlier. 332/

A citation of FDD's output during these years in terms of English pages produced demonstrates this effect even more graphically and also serves to illustrate the rather dramatic growth of FDD operations. The division produced some 20,500 pages in 1947. With the onset of greater stability in 1948, annual production attained a plateau of 50,000-60,000 pages in the period 1948-1950. With the augmented T/O of 1951 and the start of the contractual facility, production almost doubled, about 114,000 pages, and increased to roughly 136,000 in 1952 and 165,500 in 1953. 333/

Among other functions of FDD were activities of a relatively minor nature which, in essence, amounted to by-products of the main operation. These included the preparation of reference aids, the performance of reverse translations, and a brief trial at exploiting the domestic (US) foreign-language press. The contribution of these and similar functions in terms of volume were in the overall not great, but they served in many instances to expedite the work of the intelligence community and should be mentioned for this reason.

In July 1951, George Carey called attention to already extant reference aids compiled by FDD personnel and declared that more were contemplated. These included glossaries of technical terms, transliteration tables, generic standardization lists, and similar collections not normally available in regular reference sources. A sampling of these aids had found considerable favor among IAC agencies. In view of FDD's capability to undertake this type of project, permission was requested for the division to start a new, unclassified publication series entitled Reference Aids. 334/ Since the additional workload to prepare the new series would be negligible, the Advisor for Management, DDA, recommended approval and this was granted on 27 September 1951. 335/ FDD preparation of reference aids continued until the end of 1955, when, on recommendation of the Inspector General, responsibility for this function was transferred to the Office of Central Reference (OCR) with a stipulation of FDD assistance if translation work was involved. By that time, FDD had produced a total of 46 reference aids. 336/

Reverse translation was a part of FDD operations almost from the division's beginning to its end. The function of translating documents, usually but not always from English, into a second non-English language was in the strict sense not part of FDD's defined mission, since it did not involve the collection of raw intelligence. It was accepted as an added function simply because the division was the only organization in the community capable of performing it on a broad scale. However, it further increased an already heavy workload. Bagnall complained of this fact in 1951 on the grounds that many of the reverse-translation projects — for example, a guerrilla warfare manual and a short wave radio manual — were destined for combat operations rather than to serve intelligence needs. He therefore proposed a choice of refusing further work of this kind, recruitment of additional personnel, or curtailment of the normal workload. 337/ He was advised to do none of these but to continue to perform reverse translation as best he could with the facilities available. 338/ Thus, the work went on.

The domestic (US) foreign-language press as a source of intelligence was exploited on a limited scale during World War II. There were in this country at that time more than 1,000 foreign-language newspapers and journals which, according to the 1940 census, served a large minority of 11,500,000 foreign-born individuals and some 23 million citizens of foreign parentage resident in the United States. It was therefore felt that these constituted an important source of foreign and domestic intelligence, particularly for giving advance notice of events

in foreign countries which had not yet reached the attention of the United States government's usual sources of information. 339/
Even before World War II, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) had exploited these publications in the interest of internal security, and during the war the intelligence organs of the Army, Navy, and Air Corps had to some degree searched the domestic press for intelligence information. The only agency to engage in a comprehensive coverage of this material was the Foreign Nationalities Branch of CSS, which did so from 1941 until its deactivation in the fall of 1945. Thereafter, the only coverage — and on a limited scale — was conducted by the State Department. 340/
In July 1946 it was agreed that State would retain responsibility for coverage of the domestic foreign-language press, but with coordination by the DCI. 341/

In 1948, the AD/O requested FDB to make a trial run of one month's issues of 16 domestic newspapers to determine the value of exploiting the emigre press. The results were largely negative. The best sources were found to be Swedish and Greek publications, but these covered areas better served by readily available native newspapers. FDB therefore recommended abandonment of the project. Of the 733 known foreign-language publications issued in the United States in 1948, the FDB study revealed that less than two percent had any potential intelligence value. Despite the meagre

results, in November 1949, a new study was undertaken by FDD and this effort yielded two Albanian, two Chinese, two Jewish, and several Russian newspapers of some value. 342/ In 1951, further monitoring disclosed several new newspapers serving emigres from Satellite countries which gave promising results. 343/ At State Department request, FDD continued monitoring and exploiting the emigre press for the next few years, but this source was at all times suspect because of the possibility of foreign control with the attendant lack of credibility in such publications. In 1956, finally convinced of the unproductive nature of the undertaking, the State Department expressed its opinion that emigre publications were, at best, confusing and, at worst, unreliable. It therefore recommended an end to the project. 344/ In November 1956, on the basis of this recommendation, FDD ceased to include information from emigre publications in its scheduled reports. 345/ As a source for FDD exploitation, the emigre press proved to be a very minor part of the division's program. Though the effort devoted to it was small, the time spent on it at the expense of more valuable sources was grudgingly given. What is surprising is the fact that the project lasted as long as it did.

#### C. Special Problems

1. Source Curtailment and Security Classification Policy As is true of any operation of the magnitude of FDD's mission, problems of one kind or other and in varying degrees of severity were bound to arise, particularly in its early stages. One of these problems for FDD already touched on, pertained to the severe limitations the USSR placed after 1947 on the export of publications not only greatly restricting the number of titles, but also the number of copies released. Although approximately 8,000 newspapers and 1,400 periodicals were known to be published in the Soviet Union by 1954, foreign subscriptions were generally limited to the Moscow newspapers (the so-called central press), to two newspapers from each of the republic capitals, and to approximately 300 periodicals ranging from pure propaganda items to technical journals. The limitations on the number of subscriptions allowed were most stringently applied to scientific and technical journals. 346/

The use of published material and "open" sources for intelligence information had undoubtedly long been familiar to the Soviets as to any other government. The Soviets had been aware of German exploitation of such USSR material before and during World War II. In fact, an officer of the US Embassy in Moscow was informed in 1947 that the wartime use of provincial newspapers for intelligence purposes was well known to the Soviet government and that the government had no intention of allowing such use to occur again. In general, this situation also applied in varying degrees for the areas within the Soviet orbit outside the USSR. It appeared likely, therefore, that the diminution of sources was part of a general policy rather than due to the Soviets' specific knowledge of US and British exploitation of the material, although this awareness of the latter could be assumed. 347/

By 1950 the rapid and continuing decrease in the quality and quantity of information from the USSR and from areas under its control had reached such a level as to create concern in the Agency, and various avenues to relieve the situation were explored. Among methods suggested was the peripheral stationing of US personnel in strategic posts, such as Paris, Frankfurt, Vienna, and Trieste, to facilitate collection of printed matter from the Soviet Bloc through contacts with refugees and defectors as well as by other means. 348/ The Peripheral Reporting Program established as a result of this initiative was endorsed by the DCI in August 349/ and proved quite successful.

Despite emergency efforts such as this, the situation created difficulties for the division and the Agency. In essence,

it came down to a problem of whether or not to classify FDD publications and, if this were done, what level of classification to apply. A high classification would protect the continuing receipt of source material but would defeat the desire of the intelligence community to give as wide dissemination of FDD's output to the public sector as possible. A low classification would have the opposite effect. This created a dilemma.

In 1948, FDB press exploitation was, as we know, based primarily on sources obtained from the British. In November of that year, George Carey reported to the DCI concerning a conference

25**X**1

Chief, FDB had been re-

had not been discussed

25**X**1

quested to consider upgrading the FDB Press Summaries from a "Confidential" and the Periodical Abstracts from a "Restricted" classification to "Secret." FDB's Bibliography of Russian

25X1

Periodicals, unclassified,

25X1

at the meeting, but Carey was of the opinion that these publications would also have to be considered. Carey foresaw no problem in reclassifying the *Soviet Press Extracts* since its dissemination was limited to the TAC agencies but, in view of the wider distribution given the other publications, he believed there would be

open criticism of CIA for "classifying newspapers and magazines" if security measures were suddenly applied to this material. The distinction of an intelligence agency processing this material on a selective and immediate basis would, he felt, not be apparent to non-intelligence users. Carey emphasized the urgency of resolving the problem by pointing out that from 1947 to 1948 receipt of periodicals of intelligence value (economic, military, etc.) had declined and receipt of scientific journals had been reduced from 150 to 100. 350/ The outcome was a general reclassification of FDB publications to a higher level. In January 1949, DCI Hillenkoetter, with IAC approval, informed the British that the Soviet Press Extracts and the Periodical Abstracts (Scientific) had been classified "Secret" and the Periodical Abstracts (General) would be discontinued and replaced by separate information reports classified individually but no lower than "Confidential." The Bibliography of Russian Periodicals would remain unclassified. 351/

In November 1949, in a follow-up to the more stringent classification policy adopted relative to Soviet sources, Bagnall recommended a minimum classification of "Confidential" for all information extracted by FDD on Satellite countries. This recommendation was based on a speech by the Hungarian party chief in which he warned that press publication of economic data could be

detrimental to the Hungarian national interest and stated that production figures should be expressed in percentages rather than hard totals. A similar situation existed in Poland. 352/Bagnall's proposal received prompt approval.

The Soviet Bloc's restriction on release of source material was a long-term phenomenon, but there was a gradual erosion in the FDD policy on classification, in large part the result of consumer pressure to permit broader dissemination. For example, in 1950, an Office of Policy Coordination request for clearance to release the contents of classified reports was disapproved by Bagnall, 353/ but by September 1951 Carey formally requested a downgrading of classification of FDD publications. This request was based on the change in the report format from collated to individual extracts from open sources which did not disclose intelligence requirements. Carey recommended that the existing minimum restriction of "Secret" be rescinded and FDD authorized to classify individual extracts and translations from Soviet sources according to the nature of the information and the security of the sources. 354/ This concept, in general, governed FDD's classification policy from then on.

25X1

#### 2. Transliteration

Inherent in FDD operations was the rendition of clear and accurate English text from an increasing number of foreign

- 202 -

# **SECRET**

languages and dialects. This function was complicated during the early period of the organization's growth and expansion not only by the burgeoning linguistic requirements encountered but also by the many-faceted subject content of the source material processed by the division. A further complication was created by the growing number of linguists, of varying degrees of competence and drawn from widely separated war-time units, who were involved in the work of the division. The result was a lack of uniformity in the translation of common foreign text into English. Even greater difficulties were encountered in the rendition and standardization of proper names and specialized technical terminology unique to particular subject categories. It became obvious very early that a program of standardization would have to be instituted in order to create in the intelligence community a feeling of confidence in the fidelity of the division's product. Since the division was only one, if the largest, unit in the community engaged in translation service, the problem was not limited to FDD alone and was therefore approached from a community-wide standpoint. However, as a "common service" organization, the division played a leading role in the formulation of standards during the next few years.

As early as May 1947, following a meeting of CIG Office representatives — including John Bagnall — to form an ad hoc

committee to consider the problem of foreign geographical names, DB expressed great interest in establishing standards for geographical names based on its unique collection of sources and its exploitation of foreign documents. 355/ In October 1948, as a result of the studies on this problem which the committee had initiated, through George Carey, recommended further studies leading to the establishment of a permanent government. board similar to the US Board of Geographic Names (BGN) which would be empowered to decide on the authorized transliteration and spelling of all personal names and words other than geographic. 356/ The proposal was enthusiastically endorsed by the other CIA offices, 357/ a committee was formed on 8 December 1948, and on 29 December the first meeting of the CIA Transliteration Committee (CTC) was held. Bagnall, temporary chairman of the meeting, was elected permanent chairman of the new committee. initial objectives of the CTC were to determine the most acceptable transliteration system for each language with a view toward establishment of transliteration standards throughout CIA and to recommend to ICAPS that discussions be held with IAC members to reach agreement on the subject. Subcommittees were formed to deal with major categories of languages -- that is, Slavic, Near Fastern, and Far Eastern - and the appropriate FDB division chiefs

25X1

were appointed respective chairmen of the subcommittees. 358/

The new groups met in the course of the next few months with representatives of the IAC agencies and on the basis of their deliberations the CTC recommended the use of the appropriate BGN system wherever possible or, otherwise, familiar systems already in use. The recommendation was approved by a memorandum for the DCI to all IAC agencies on 7 July and was given official force by issuance of an Administrative Instruction on 27 June 1949 dated 31 (subsequently replaced by CIA Regulation January 1952). This provided for the transliteration of Slavic languages by the appropriate BGN systems, Chinese by the Wade-Giles system, Japanese by the Hepburn system, and Korean by the McCune-Reischauer system. Instructions for other languages were to be issued when appropriate systems had been approved. 359/ The committee further determined that, in accordance with Public Law 242 of the 80th Congress, the BGN and the Secretary of Interior were to provide for uniformity in geographic nomenclature and orthography throughout the federal government. To avoid the confusion of establishing a separate system of transliteration for words other than geographic names, the CIC approved in principle the concept that wherever the BGN had established a transliteration system for foreign geographic names, that system would be adopted as standard for all transliteration. With this

25X1

- 205 -

determination in mind, systems for all the major foreign languages were developed and approved by the CTC. 360/ By March 1951, transliteration tables for some of the lesser Far Eastern and for the Near Eastern languages were adopted. It was agreed that systems for the rare languages be held in abeyance until problems relating to these arose in the Agency. 361/

This action provided a basis for uniform transliteration practices in the intelligence community and, with some exceptions, it proved successful. The differences which arose were essentially minor in nature and were usually resolved by liaison between FDD and the differing parties.

To formalize the procedures adopted and to make the transliteration systems more accessible to their users, preparation was undertaken in mid-1951 of a *Transliteration Handbook* which covered the broad spectrum of all major languages handled by FDD. In order to assure wide dissemination, it was decided to issue the publication in unclassified form under the imprimatur of the Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) without reference to CIA. FDD therefore turned over the material it had prepared for the document to FBIS. 362/ The *Handbook* was completed and published in early 1954, 363/ and a CIA regulation\* was issued

		•	
*	CIA	Regulation	

والمتعام والمراب والمراب

25**X**1

authorizing its use in official Agency intelligence reports and publications and by collection offices insofar as sources and operations permitted. With its work completed, the CTC was dissolved and from then on any further transliteration problems were to be referred to Chief, FDD. 364/

Meanwhile, in mid-1951, to implement the decision on standardization, the CTC had appointed a five-man subcommittee called the Ad Hoc Committee on Standardization of Translated Russian Terminology; Bagnall, and later served as chairman. Other members were and all of FDD. The subcommittee met five times between 17 June 1951 and 13 January 1952 and in that period dealt with USSR Ministries, Russian organization and administrative terms, and agencies of the Soviet Council of Ministers. committee presented its final report on 29 May 1952. It then adjourned sine die and the results of its work were transferred for action to the IAC Advisory Committee established under the new NSCID-16. 365/

25X1

25X1

25X1

The transliteration standardization problem was one which resisted full resolution and remained with FDD as long as the division existed. In 1955, Bagnall, as chairman of the NSCID-16 Exploitation Subcommittee, brought up the subject again after

a review of transliteration problems in the community and requested a survey in the IAC agencies on the use made of the Transliteration Handbook. 366/ The problem surfaced again in 1957 when the question was posed as to the extent of progress in getting other agencies to use the recommended Russian transliteration system. 367/ In 1961, representing CIA at a conference on standardization of Russian transliteration sponsored by the National Science Foundation (NSF), reported that the attendees recognized the need for standardization but the majority of them, with the BGN dissenting, favored adoption of the British Standards Institution system. 368/ Finally, in 1965, a Working Group on Transliteration, with in attendance for FDD, discussed the need for a standard unambiguous transliteration system (computer oriented) within the United States Intelligence Board (USIB) agencies and, if necessary, the development of such a system. 369/ To hope to achieve full standardization was to expect the impossible. The work of the CTC had made an important contribution in standardization for the CIA and to some extent the IAC, but enforcement beyond this level seemed unlikely.

25X1

25X1

# 3. Copyright Constraints

A recurrent and irritating problem in FDD operations throughout the life of the division was the risk of copyright

- 208 -



infringement involved in the use of foreign publications. was a problem which also affected other parts of the Agency but it was particularly relevant to FDD due to the nature of the division's activity. This risk was never a factor in FDD's use of Soviet documents since the USSR was not a signatory to either of the major international conventions relating to copyright, the Universal Copyright Convention (UCC) and the International Copyright Convention (ICC). The United States, on the other hand, was a signatory of the first although not of the second. The complications inherent in copyright laws as they related to FDD operations had to be considered, however, in connection with the processing of Western publications, and in the late 1950s this was also becoming a factor in the exploitation of Satellite sources as some of the Soviet Bloc countries took steps to join the UCC or to establish bilateral reciprocal copyright agreements with the United States.

Although FDD had earlier shown some uneasiness about possible copyright infringement and had requested guidance on the Agency's policy in this matter, 370/ the division's problems relating to safeguards against infringement really developed in November 1953 with an executive order eliminating the the classification "Restricted." To cover copyright material, FDD

initially resorted to the use of the newly created control "For Official Use only" (FOUO) in conjunction with a caveat concerning laws relating to copyright, limiting the material to FOUO and placing the onus of violation on the releasing individual. After 1953, FDD's uneasiness about the publication of copyrighted material resulted in several revisions of the above-mentioned caveat. 371/ The actual value of this caveat was suspect, at least in the opinion of the AD/IC, who believed that it served only as 00's (and FDD's) attempt to confine the use of copyright information to official purposes without really providing a legal safeguard against liability. that 00, with General Counsel assistance, recommend appropriate legislative or executive action to provide adequate protection to the DCI. 372/ A bill, HR 6716, to provide some measure of protection against copyright infringement finally came before the Congress and was approved in mid-1955. 373/

25X1

25X1

In a review of FDD copyright procedures in October 1955, the Office of the General Counsel cited a disturbing feature of the new law which immunized the federal government but not federal employees from copyright infringement. The law further provided that suit against the government could not be brought by a US citizen but made no mention of the degree of liability, if any, if the suit were brought by a non-citizen. 374/

The continuing concern about the copyright problem cropped up once again in October 1957. Carey pointed out that it was FDD practice to keep the classification of its reports as low as was consistent with security. Where possible, the division used devices, such as the use of non-USIB organizations, to disseminate its material as widely as possible to US industrial, academic, and scientific sources.

25X1 25X1

25X1.

In October 1958, particularly in the interest of safeguarding FDD's expanded publication efforts through JPRS,

Chief of JPRS/DC, conferred with George D. Cary, Copyright Office,

Library of Congress. Cary stated that few registrations were made

with the US Copyright Office by publishers or authors in the Eastern

European nations with which the United States had bilateral reciprocal

copyright agreements. At that time no Soviet Bloc nation belonged

to the UCC to which the United States had subscribed. Cary rec-

- 211 -

Bloc material make no mention of the existence of a copyright.

In the case of Western European material, he discouraged the use of a copyright warning and recommended instead obtaining permission of the copyright holders prior to release. 377/

Based partially on Cary's advice, FDD practice from then on was to use no copyright warning on publications derived from Soviet Bloc materials. On unclassified reports from Western sources involving copyright restrictions, however, the division continued to apply a revised warning, suggested by Cary, under the restrictive control FOUO. 378/

In 1960, FDD was compelled to make a change in its procedures when it became known through the US Embassy in Prague that Czechoslovakia had ratified the UCC agreement in September 1959 and had adhered to its principles effective 1 January 1960. To cover this development, the division applied the same practices in regard to Czech material as was done with that of the Western nations. 379/ There also appeared to be some justification for concluding that other East European nations would follow the Czech lead and become signatories to the UCC in the near future. In light of this possibility a ruling on FDD's legal obligations with respect to East European copyrights was requested from the General Counsel. 380/ FDD made preparations to deal with the problem should it arise, but with the exception of Czechoslovakia

it never became an issue.

In 8 September 1960, Public Law 86-726 was enacted. This legislation amended a section of the US code covering inventions and patents so as to include copyright. The amendment appeared to safequard any federal employee or contractor concerned and provided recourse to the copyright holder through action against the United States for recovery of damages. However, a second paragraph of the amendment provided that the section did not apply to any claim arising in a foreign country. appeared that the US government was subject to suit by foreign nationals for copyright infringement, but it was still unclear whether such suit could also be directed against government employees as individuals as opposed to suit against the US gov-In view of this, for greater protection FDD adopted a policy of applying more restrictive classification or controls and, in the case of copyright material, to limit the number of copies for dissemination. 381/

In the long run, the copyright problem did not interfere seriously with normal FDD operations, but the potential threat of legal action created the necessity for extra vigilance and thus an additional complication in operational procedures.

### 4. Dissemination and Reproduction

FDD operations were rather seriously hampered during the formative years by dissemination problems, in particular the persistent time lag which developed in providing consumers with the FDD product. The physical distance separating FDD from the Offices and agencies which it served caused the division to perform less effectively in supplying overt information to the consumer than would have been the case had it been more favorably located. In this connection, FDD was a victim of security and logistics syndromes in the Agency.

Distance was not the only factor, however. Delays of one kind or other, whether in the receipt of sources, their actual processing, or the final publication and dissemination of the product, were perhaps even more to blame. Whatever was at fault, the problem led to recurrent recriminations and bad feeling between the division and other units of CIA. To dispel some of this, urgent needs were satisfied in rare instances with "advance copies" of FDD reports prior to submitting them for publication and, as time passed, this device was used with increasing frequency. This was, however, an expedient and did not solve the basic problem. As with other difficulties encountered by FDD, attempts at solution were protracted, but persistent effort on

the part of those concerned brought some improvement in dissemination by the mid-1950s.

Regarding itself as the victim of circumstances over which it exercised little or no control in the matter of dissemination, a responsibility mainly of OCD, FDD engaged in an exchange of memoranda with the latter in 1952 and finally to a mutual study of the problem. In July 1952, George Carey informed OCD that an OO survey of FDD reports had revealed a time lag of 16-17 days between the time the duplimats were transmitted from FDD and the final reports were distributed by OCD. 382/ The Deputy Assistant Director for Collection and Dissemination (DAD/CD) disputed Carey's figure and cited an OCD survey which had shown the delay factor to be 7.3 days, the difference accounted for by 00's use of calendar rather than working days. 383/ 00 countered with a third survey which revealed a time-lag range for disseminating FDD reports of from 7 to 15 working days, the 7-day elapsed-time figure representing FDD's Periodical Abstracts, which was distributed not through OCD but directly from the Reproduction Division. 384/ A subsequent survey by FDD, covering the last three months of 1952, showed little improvement. The dissemination time-lag this time ranged from one to 39 days, with an average of 14. 385/

The effort to solve the problem continued during 1953.

A series of conferences with OCD was without result, and still another survey, covering the period November 1953 - February 1954, revealed no progress. 386/ Persistence began to pay off, however, and by mid-1954 dissemination delays were considerably reduced.

Revised methods of processing reports through OCD, assisted by FDD's cooperation in supplying multiple copies for screening, dropped the average elapsed time from 14 to ten working days. 387/

Unfortunately, OCD's improvement in dissemination did not measurably affect the time required to place FDD reports at the consumers' disposal. Report reproduction was another delaying factor. As demands on CIA's Reproduction Division increased, time-lags built up and in extreme cases delays of as much as 79 to 90 days occurred in the printing and reproduction of FDD reports, 388/ accompanied by continuing complaints from Agency analysts. This resulted in a shift of FDD's attention to the Reproduction Division in an effort to break the log jam. A conference between FDD and Reproduction Division officers was held in July 1955 to examine the cause of printing delays and to try to get production on a current basis. This meeting led finally to improved results and much of the backlog was eliminated as a result of suggestions stemming from it. 389/

The foregoing account of the dissemination/reproduction issue is by no means exhaustive but serves to illustrate the magnitude of the problem. It was a situation over which FDD exercised no direct control, but since the success of the division's operations was directly related to the speed with which its reports were dispatched to its consumers, FDD was vitally concerned in eliminating or at least alleviating the persistent difficulties in this area.

This chapter has presented an account of the origins of FDD's production program as well as a recital of some representative problems encountered in its development. Once established, the program did not remain fixed but was from then on attuned to the intelligence goals of the Agency. As a result, it came under constant self-scrutiny and, as CIA needs evolved, it was adapted to the directions called for. This made necessary close FDD cooperation with consumer Offices and the coordination of FDD reporting methods with consumer requirements. The next chapter deals with this aspect.

Declassified in Part - Sar	initized Copy Approved	I for Release 2012/10/16 :	CIA-RDP05-01429R000100060001-5
----------------------------	------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------------

Secret

25X1

**Secret**